

Islamic Politics

Maulana Syed Abul A'la Maududi

Translated by
Dr. Maaz Amjad Warsi

Contents

Prologue	5
Introduction to the Purpose	13
The Decline of the Islamic Movement	23
Two Paths Before Muslims	37
Majority and Minority	49
Complaints	55
The Path Backwards	65
The Message of Islam And the Mission of Muslim	75
The Only Course of Action For Muslims	91
The Straight Path of Islam And the Paths of Deviance From It	101
The Process of Islamic Revolution	133
Need for a Righteous Party	165

Prologue

TWO COLLECTIONS OF my articles under the title of "Muslims and Current Political Conflict" have already been published before. Now, a third instalment of this series is being released. The seeming gap between my two previous collections and this third one is so big that a person, at a first glance, might be led to believe that I have suddenly changed my position since the publication of the second part of the series and contradicted many of the things I had said earlier. But the truth is that in these three books of mine, there is a gradual development towards one goal which I want to make it clear here so that the readers do not have to face any kind of uneasiness.

With a little bit of thought, it can be understood by anyone that reinvigorating an old movement after its fall and decline is much more difficult and complex than launching a new movement. The path for the one launching a new movement is totally clear. He faces only those people who are strangers to this movement. He only has to propagate his principles and objectives. Then, either people reject or accept his message. But the one who wants to revive and revitalise an old movement after its fall and decline, he not only has to present his message before the unfamiliar ones but also keep an eye on the familiar ones. He cannot ignore those people in any way who already have been associated with this movement and hence are closer to it than the strangers. The first thing he needs to do is to diagnose how much the

process of decline has already occurred in them and to what extent the influence of the original movement is still found in their lives? Then, he needs to think about stopping them from straying any more than the extent to which they have already strayed away and preserving whatever effects they still have. Their position as regards this movement is just like the assets a person is left with and obviously someone who is wise can never bear to lose even whatever little he has. It is but inevitable, therefore, that he must try to keep the bond these people currently have with the movement alive to whatever extent it is at present and stop it from further deterioration. After gaining some amount of success in this strategy of preservation and prevention it becomes necessary for him to prevent them from staying in the same current condition. Rather, he should try to pull them back to the original movement and ensure that no other thing becomes their objective and the pivot of their struggle. After going through all these stages, he finally gets the opportunity to make his message public and he reaches to the stage from which the work of the one who launches a new movement begins.

Since the revival of Islamic movement is in my view, I too have to advance towards my objective with the same graduality as has been pointed out above. The initial four years of Tarjuman-ul-Quran were spent on this very effort that the deterioration manifesting in the Muslim community in various forms and shapes could be arrested. This effort was underway that all of a sudden in 1937 the Muslims of India were now being faced with the danger of succumbing to the movement for nationalism which was sweeping the country like a hurricane. It is but obvious that no matter how opposed we are to

* My book *Tanqeehat* (Eng. translation *West vs. Islam*) is a reflection of this effort of mine.

the current oppressive regime and our desire to escape this system might even be stronger than the members of the Congress Party, we can never tolerate to see the people who are more or less within the sphere of Islamic influence get absorbed into this movement for Indian nationalism and nation-worship implemented through the party's strategies such as Mass contact, Wardha Scheme, Vidya Mandir Scheme and through the force of its political and economic superiority and to see their views and lives altered to such an extent that after two generations Islam becomes as alien to them as it is in Japan or America. One more thing which made this danger even more worrisome was that the most influential section of the religious leaders of Muslims turned into the biggest champions of the movement for nationalism. In its frenzy of blind hatred of the British, this section shut its eyes as to how the promotion of this movement would impact the future of Islam in India? Therefore, to stop this menace in its tracks I published a series of articles titled "Muslims and Current Political Tension" first at the end of 1937 and the rest in 1939. The thing which was on my mind in these collections was that at least Muslims should not fall any further from the current status of their "Muslimness" and lose their identity. That's why, I have tried to awaken the sense of Islamic nationhood in them. I warned them of the harms of a secular democratic regime which was being established in India on the single hypothesis of nationalism. I explained to them their constitutional guarantees and "fundamental rights" by trusting which Muslims were willing to get trapped in this fatal democratic constitution. I presented the vision of "The Land of Islam" as the objective so that the scatteredness of thoughts and actions, produced as a result of lack of any objective, could be eliminated and so that they may get a goal in their lives to keep their eyes on which is neither deviated from the original Islamic orientation nor so high that it kills courage.

Since the task of preservation was a priority at that time,

I purposely avoided saying anything against 'Independence', 'Nationalism', 'National Culture', 'Sovereignty', 'Majority and Minority' and other such ideas current at that time. By accepting the meanings of those terms as they were – meanings which were well-established in people's minds - I spoke in that very language which could be understood by the people. Similarly, instead of discussing about the intended objective, I deemed it fit to limit the discussion to the ground reality so that the mind may not suffer from scatteredness and the attempt to make one single leap to the distant objective may not become the cause for losing the nearest objective.

The purpose for which this task was undertaken is now fulfilled in the last 2 to 3 years by the grace of God and now there is no danger that Muslims of India would lose themselves to nationalism or attach themselves to a democratic system which is built solely on the hypothesis of nationalism. All this has happened not because of any human effort but merely by God's grace. It is because of His favour alone that such causes were created which convinced the Muslims to avoid this danger. For all those people who enjoyed the divine grace to deliver this task, it is a moment of gratitude rather than pride.

After the completion of this phase, the other question that was before me was whether to allow the Muslims to be satisfied with this conclusion or to push them towards the real objective of Islam by creating further restlessness in them? That is, whether to allow the Muslims to remain stuck in those same wrong concepts of politics and society which they had learned from the western Jahiliyyah (unIslamic concepts) or to present to them the political and social concepts of Islam not only in the capacity of academic and intellectual concepts but also as a practical vision and goal? That is, whether to allow Muslims to pursue the maintenance of only their own individualities or to tell them that their individuality is not an end in itself but is rather required for a greater mission? The moment this question appeared before me

my conscience made a categorical decision that the first condition is wrong and only the second condition is the right one. Even if there was no other alternative, I would still have undertaken this task. However, unfortunately immediately after the publication of part 2, two more reasons were produced which forced me to start writing this series of articles, the collection of which is now being presented to the readers.

The first reason was that in the era of this new movement the leadership of the Muslim masses went into the hands of such a group which is unacquainted with the knowledge of Islam and is working for the worldly benefit of its nation purely under the influence of nationalism. The element of Islamic knowledge in this group is scarcer than a drop in a bucket. And a group with such little knowledge does not have the right to guide and lead. This was a result of the wrong political posturing of the Islamic scholars, an attitude they are so obstinate about. And I am observing that never before in India had the common Muslims trusted with such sincerity any irreligious leaders who are so unacquainted with the Islamic knowledge; they have, for the most part, always trusted the scholars. To me, this situation is not any less dangerous to Islam than the movement for nationalism. Even if the Muslims of India succeed in maintaining their separate existence in the capacity of an irreligious nation under the leadership of these people who lack any knowledge of Islam – as has been the case in Turkey and Iran – then what difference will there be in this manner of existence of Muslims and the manner of existence of a non-Muslim nation?! If the diamond itself has lost its essence of being a diamond then what does it matter to a jeweller whether this damn diamond remains a stone or breaks down into pieces and mixes with the soil!!

The second reason was that I found nationalistic motivation more than religious in this movement. Although Islam and Muslim nationalism have been intermingled since a long time among the Muslims of India, in the recent years the Islamic element has been

decreased and nationalistic element increased to such an extent in this mixture that I worry that it might turn into crass nationalism. The moral descent has reached to such a level that a prominent political leader of this movement was once heard saying that the wealthy Muslims of Bombay (modern-day Mumbai) and Calcutta (modern-day Kolkata) are paying visits to Anglo-Indian prostitutes when in fact Muslim prostitutes are more worthy of their patronage! After stooping to such a low point, tolerating Muslim nationalism any further would be a grave sin in my eyes. It is but obvious that in order to generate a stable social life in individuals it is enough to create a common loyalty among them whether that loyalty is to God, nation or country, it doesn't matter. So, from this perspective, for those who seek only social stability it is not a cause for concern that this objective be achieved through the common loyalty to the nation instead of God, however, on what part of the earth and under what part of the Sun would we, the believers in God, be able to hide ourselves if we too were to merely watch the slaves of God assembling for a common loyalty to anything but God, stand idly by and do nothing.

These are the motivations by which the articles of this collection were written. In these articles, I have clearly criticised various Muslim organisations and at some places their leaders too. But as God is my witness, I do not have any personal grudge towards any person or party. I am just a friend of truth and a foe of falsehood. I have provided my arguments and evidences in favour of what I deem to be truth and against what I believe to be false. If someone disagrees with me and explains to me my mistake with evidence, I can change my position. As for those who get enraged merely because something was said against their favourite personalities or parties and do not even care to regard whether whatever has been said is true or false then I do not care about the anger of such people. Neither will I respond to their vituperation, nor budge from my position.

—Abul A'la

The other name of this

permanent, universal and impartial law is "Islam."

The One Who has revealed it to man is that very Originator of the universe Who fashioned the natures of both man and the universe. This is not a thought of a nationalist who looks at the world from the perspective of national interests. This is not the ideology of a class-leader who views everything from the point of view of a class. In short, this is not the outcome of any human endeavour which is held captive to the interests of any specific era, conditions, person or group. It is, in actuality, derived from the guidance of the Lord of the worlds and this Lord is He in Whose eyes everyone is equal. He views a human as a human not as an Indian, German or Italian nor as a labourer, peasant or capitalist. He is not interested in peoples and nations but only in humans.

Introduction to the Purpose

ALL THE LAWS of nature, without exception, are permanent, universal and impartial. The law, under which the air has been operating since millions of years, is still the same law and will be the same law until the Last Day. The changes of time have no impact on it. The laws of light and heat operating in one part of the world are the same for other parts of the world. It never happens and can never happen that the nature of heat is one in the east and another in the west, that the speed of light is one in the north and another in the south. The laws of construction and destruction, growth and decay, birth and death are applied equally to everyone. Favouritism, treachery or partisanship are not found in them. Nature does not have a relationship with one which it has with another. It is not a friend to one and a foe to another. It is not kind to one and cruel to another. One who puts his hand in the fire will get burned, one who drinks poison will die and one who eats food will gain strength. It is not possible, within the borders of nature's realm, that a matchstick would produce a flame for one and a stream of water for another.

The predisposition, upon which man has been created, is an aspect of that same nature which encompasses the whole universe. Therefore, the laws of human nature are as permanent, universal and impartial as the laws of the nature of the universe. No matter how much the outward appearance may change with the change of times, realities do not change. The difference, which was between knowledge and superstition 10,000 years ago, is the same now too and will remain the same till the Day of Judgement. The reality of justice and injustice

which was 2000 years before Christ is the same 2000 years after Christ.

That which is truth in China is also the truth in America and that which is false for a black is also false for a white. The law of nature for human happiness and unhappiness and human success and failure is totally impartial. This law does not treat individuals, nations and races differently. The means of happiness and unhappiness are the same for everyone. The one who applies and supplies means of unhappiness cannot attain happiness just because he is related to a specific country, race or nation and similarly the one who applies and supplies means of happiness will not be deprived of the fruits of his labour merely because he is related to a certain race or carries a certain surname.

The other name of this permanent universal and impartial law of human nature is "Islam." The One Who has revealed it to man is that very Originator of the universe Who fashioned the natures of man and the universe. This is not a thought of a nationalist who looks at the world from the perspective of national interests. This is not the ideology of a class-leader who views everything from the point of view of a class. In short, this is not the outcome of any human endeavour which is held captive to the interests of any specific era, conditions, person or group. It is, in actuality, derived from the guidance of the Lord of the worlds and this Lord is He in Whose eyes everyone is equal. He views a human as a human not as an Indian, German or Italian or as a labourer, peasant or capitalist. He is not interested in peoples and nations but only in humans. All the principles of integrity, morality and civility it speaks of are free from every kind of limitedness.

In general, the success and prosperity of all human beings in every stage of their lives have been taken into account in these principles. They are universal just as the rest of the laws of nature. They do not have any exclusive relationship with any person or nation. Whoever professes and practices them will succeed whether he is a Roman or an Abyssinian, Aryan or Semitic, American or Asian and whoever strays from these principles will lose even if he happens to be

the son of a Prophet. Creating human life on these universal principles of Islam is the duty of all those who believe in the truth of Islam. And since we do believe in it, it is the actual objective of all our efforts.

But when we say that our mission is to transform our country first and then finally the whole world into "Dar al-Islam" (Abode of Islam), an uninitiated person could misconstrue it to mean that we too might want to seek power and dominance in the world just as any nationalistic zealot. He would think that since these people are born in the "nation" of Muslims, seeking power must be their mission. He would believe that if they were born among the Hindus, they would have been Moonje and Savarkar. If they were born in Germany, they would have appeared in the form of Hitler and Göring. Had they been born in an Italian household then they would have emerged as Mussolini.

The only reason this misconception arises is because the term "Dar al-Islam" is being considered to be synonymous with "Dar al-Muslimeen" (Abode of the Muslims) when the truth is there is a huge difference between the two. If those people, who have entered into the fold of Islam by reciting the Shahada (Testimony of faith) and are considered to be Muslims from a societal perspective, govern in unIslamic ways then their government would surely be called "Muslim government" for coincidentally the rulers happen to be believers in Islam but such a government would never be an "Islamic Government" nor the term "Dar al-Islam" be applied to it in its true sense. Nay! Our objective is not the establishment of such a "Muslim government". If we were to seek the supremacy of our people in such a way and if our objective was to make the arrogance of wealth and power exclusive to our people by occupying the seat of government through military force then Islam itself will step in front of us to declare us tyrants and mischief-mongers for it clearly says:

تِلْكَ الدَّارُ الْآخِرَةُ نَجْعَلُهَا لِلَّذِينَ لَا يُرِيدُونَ عُلُوًّا فِي الْأَرْضِ
وَلَا فَسَادًا

*As for the Abode of the Hereafter, We shall assign it
exclusively for those who do not seek glory on earth nor want to
cause mischief.* (Al-Qasas 28:83)

Truth be told the thing which is in our view is not the formation of a "Muslim government" but an "Islamic Government" we seek the rule of that same Islam which is the collection of the universal principles of integrity, morality and virtuous civilisation. This Islam is not the heritage from our or anybody else's forefathers. It does not have any special relationship with any one, whoever believes in its principles and lives accordingly is alone the standard-bearer of Islam. And from a historical perspective, even if he is from an inferior race, he can win the office of Muhammad's Caliphate. Even if he is an Abyssinian (Black) slave, he can become the leader of the nobles of Arabs and non-Arabs. Even if the members of the House of Muhammad (peace be upon him) - the House in which Islam has been running generations after generations for 1350 years - were to deviate from those principles then they won't enjoy any status in Islam. And the one who had been a Hindu or a Christian or a Zoroastrian up until yesterday and was engrossed in paganism, idol worship, alcoholism, gambling and interest were to accept and practise the natural truths of Islam today then the road to attain ever higher status of respect and greatness is wide open for him.

It becomes obvious from this brief explanation that our objective is not to seek the superiority of one nation over the other but rather to organise the system of civilisation based on these principles, which are right according to our faith and conscience. If someone were to scowl at this then we are unable to understand as to what his reasons of objections are!?

Obviously when a person or a group makes a critical and in-depth study of a philosophy of life and gets satisfied that the success of humanity and the welfare of human relations and issues are present in it at optimal levels then naturally, he gets the desire to try and change

the social life to which he himself is related, the society with which his life and death are associated and the part of humanity with which he has civilisational, political and economic relationships, in short his entire system of life according to that philosophy. The stronger the conviction he has with regards to the veracity, efficacy and usefulness of his favourite philosophy and the stronger the sentiments of love for humanity or country he has, the more restless he would be to inform his fellow humans or countrymen about the advantages of this philosophy of truth, a philosophy and a way of life in which he sees their success, welfare, glory, prosperity and happiness. And with equal intensity he would oppose the rule of those philosophies and ways of life which he considers to be wrong and harmful with full conviction. This is exactly what the human nature demands. And there is nothing unpatriotic about it. In fact, the unpatriotic thing would be to keep the philosophy and way of life, which a man honestly considers to be the only way to success, buried silently in his heart and home and allow the philosophies and ways of life which he honestly considers to be harmful to be imposed on his fellow countrymen.

Those people who have studied the democratic system of the West and consider it to be right are now trying to cast India's system of civilisation in the mould of western democracy. Those who have studied socialism and regard it to be right are now trying to see the social reconstruction of India along Marxist lines. Why are they doing this? Can any argument be provided for this other than that this is what faith and creed demand? Can any person regard this step of theirs unpatriotic or inhuman? Would this be considered honesty on their part that they try to implement the philosophy and way of life which they believe to be the path to success and happiness for their fellow countrymen and not tolerate the rule of any such system of life which in their view pushes the citizens of the country towards backwardness and hardships? Suppose that the possibility of the country's freedom and the earning of dignity for its citizens among the nations of the world

lies in the establishment of an autocratic rule or in the sustaining of the capitalist system then can a true democrat or an honest communist be appealed to give up their philosophies and accept this methodology? And should these people lay down their weapons by listening to such an appeal?

This exactly is our position too. The thing which is forcing us to give the call to "Dar al-Islam" is exactly the same thing which is forcing others to raise the slogans of "Democracy" and "communism." We have made a critical and in-depth study of Islam for years. We have analysed and verified the foundations of its creed, its worldview, its principles of morality, its system of civilisation, its laws of society and economics, its political constitution and the methodology of governance, in short each and everything related to this religion. We have meticulously researched other socio-political ideologies of the world and made a comparison with Islam. All this study, research and critical analysis totally convinced us that if there is any true success and happiness for mankind in any way of life then it is only in Islam. Compared to Islam every way of life is riddled with faults and defects. The moral foundation of any other way of life is not good and stable. No other way of life provides full opportunities for the development of personality. No other way of life has the proper balance of social justice and inter-human relationships. No other system has taken all aspects of human nature into appropriate account. Other than Islam, there is no way of life in the world which can guarantee true freedom to man, drive him to the highest levels of honour and create such a social atmosphere in which every person could reach the highest degrees of moral, spiritual and material growth as per his or her capacity and strength and also help fellow human beings in their own growth.

What does honesty demand of us after we have gained such satisfaction and conviction? Is it not the same thing which is demanded of our fellow democrats and communists?! Don't we have the obligation that we strive to organise the lives of our fellow human beings according

to the way of life which we consider with total honesty to be mercy to humanity? Why is the thing which is true for the democrats and the communists is untrue for us?!

This opinion which we have is not because we were born in Muslim households and therefore are biased in its favour. I cannot speak for my comrades but I can speak for myself that I did not find any attraction in the Islam which was in the Muslim society surrounding me. After honing my skills of critical thinking and research, the first thing that I did was that I threw away the yoke of this lifeless and spiritless religiosity from my neck; an irreligiosity which I got in inheritance. Had Islam been the religion which is found in the Muslims today then perhaps I would have joined the atheists and the agnostics because I do not have any inclination towards Nazi philosophy that I should remain entrenched in ancestor-worship merely for the sake of national life. However, the thing which prevented me from taking the road to atheism or any other social ideology and made me into a new Muslim *de novo* was the study of the Quran and the life of Prophet Muhammad (peace be upon him). It showed me the true value of humanity. It enlightened me to that concept of freedom the heights of which not even the greatest of the greatest Liberal or Revolutionary was able to reach. It presented a road map of such a great individual conduct and social justice that I have not seen any road map better than that. I saw the same perfect balance in the scheme of life proposed by it which is found in the entire order of the universe from the law which holds an atom together to the law of gravitation holding planets and galaxies together. And this thing convinced me that this Islamic order is a product of that same Wise Being Who created this world of heaven and earth with truth and justice.

Therefore, in actuality I am a newly converted Muslim. I believed in this way of life after a lot of analysis and research, which led my heart and mind to bear witness that there is no way for mankind's success and wellness other than this. I not only invite non-Muslims to Islam

but also the Muslims. And the purpose of this invitation of mine is not to sustain and develop this "Muslim society-in name only" which itself has strayed away from Islam rather this invitation is towards putting an end to the tyranny and disorder which are wide spread in the world today. This invitation is to put an end to man's overlordship and create a new world order in accordance with the road map of the Quran in which there is honour, freedom, equality, justice and goodness for man by virtue of his humanness.

Unfortunately, today the conditions in India have metamorphosed into such a toxic environment that as soon as one hears about the propagation of Islam, his mind immediately shifts on to things like increasing the vote bank, the desire for political domination and other such things of this kind. On one hand the emergence of democratic way of governance made political power and all of its implicit benefits dependent on the majority of votes and on the other hand the position of Muslims here is such that their effort to propagate their way of life cannot escape from the suspicion that this ambitious nation wants to gain political power through this way. Muslims themselves have played a huge part in consolidating these suspicions. Many of their wrong representatives created a commotion by raising the slogans of propagation in such a way as though it was only a political gimmick ready to be used in this era of democracy only for the purpose of resolving the complicated problem of their scarcity of numbers. This thing created a grave political bias against Islam. When Socialism, Communism, Fascism or any other 'ism' is preached, people view it on its merits. And they accept it if it appeals to their minds. However, as soon as 'Islamism' comes up their minds start to think that this is the way of life of a nation which has once ruled this country and because of being a minority in this era of democracy, it wants to increase its share of votes so as to occupy seats in representative assemblies and government jobs. As soon as they start toeing this line of thought, their minds and hearts immediately go into the lockdown

of bias, prejudice and bigotry and the question of analysing it based on its merits is tossed out of the debate.

We have to face these circumstances with great patience. The path of virtue and truthfulness has always been covered with hardships. Satanic paths are easy and the path of truth is filled with hurdles. With pure patience, consistent struggle and working sincerely for Allah not only the hearts of us Muslims but even that of the non-Muslims can change. When there won't be an iota of worldly interest in our efforts except for the pleasure of God and well-wishing for human kind, people will be automatically ready to grasp this reality that Islam is not a heritage of any particular race or nation but rather a human way of life whose relationships with all the human beings is just as common as human relationship with water. In Islam all human beings are equal. Just as it belongs to Muslims in the same way it could belong to the non-Muslim; as a matter of fact, if people were to move ahead of hereditary Muslims in piety, goodness and obedience to the divine law then they can even get leadership, progress, honour, stewardship of Caliphate while the hereditary Muslims will be left behind. Here, there is no Brahmanism and racism for no specific group has a permanent monopoly over honour, dignity, power and influence. Here, there is no question of the dominance of one nation over the other. Here, the Islamic preaching is not the kind where one nation is made a part of another nation just to increase its vote bank but is not treated as an equal in actual life. In Islam, never mind equality, a person can have a bigger share based on his or her merits. Here, there is no discrimination based on birth and no obstacle in the path of a person due to his or her occupation or nationality. One can fly as high as possible powered by ones character. There is absolutely no impediment in the total and holistic growth of a person; sky is the limit.

Some people wander into thinking that Islam is a 1300- or 1400-years old religion and therefore what chance is there to resurrect it as an intellectual, moral, civilisational and political movement?!

The opinion of those who watch things superficially from afar is generally wrong. This is the kind of mistake they are making too. They have not studied the Quran in-depth. They have not researched into the life of Muhammad (peace be upon him). And that's why they decide, based on assumptions, that Islam was a religious movement 1300 years ago which proved useful for the peculiar civilisational conditions of that time but now the conditions have changed quite a lot and therefore it cannot be any more beneficial in this day and age. The attitude and conduct of Muslims themselves have played a big role in the creation and entrenchment of this misconception. They themselves have not been fair to Islam, and converted it into a sacred legacy of the past instead of a movement. Whereas the truth is that if a sound minded person were to make a scientific study of Islam by eschewing historical and political prejudices, the truth will dawn upon him that Islam is not the religious movement of a specific era which is based on time-specific and area-specific circumstances rather it is a collection of principles which is based on the realities of nature in total harmony with the general laws of nature. No matter how much the thoughts and circumstances of man were to change, his nature will remain the same at any rate. No matter how many revolutions time may witness, nevertheless the realities and laws of the nature of the universe do not change. Therefore, the natural principles which were useful for the human life in the time of Noah's deluge are also useful in this century and shall remain useful even 5000 years or more from now. Whatever the change will happen it will not be in these natural principles but rather their application to the changing circumstances. In the Islamic terminology it is called "Ijtihad" which stands for the application of the principles, by properly understanding them in accordance with the spirit of the law, to new circumstances and conditions. And it is this very "Ijtihad" which makes the Islamic system dynamic and keeps adjusting its laws with the circumstances and needs.



The Decline of the Islamic Movement

WHENEVER THERE ARISES a movement in the world with a moral or political or social cause then only those people turn to it who find the objectives and the principles of the movement appealing; whose temperaments align with the spirit of the movement, whose hearts testify that this movement alone is right and rational and who step forward with total willingness to run and establish it in the world. Except for them, all the other people whose natural inclination is at variance with the objectives and principles of this movement already refuse to accept it. People are not brought into the sphere of this movement rather they come themselves. Nothing forces them to join the movement willy-nilly nor any power brings and leaves them in it like someone leaving a blind person in a forest who has no clue as to where he is and why he was brought there, rather they join the movement by researching it, analysing it and understanding it with total realisation and commitment. And when they do join it, they work for it by making its mission their own mission for it was this mission that appealed to their hearts and minds. They adopt the principles of this movement as their own for they have joined the movement by regarding these principles to be right and true. For them, running this movement becomes the mission of their lives because it is the decision of their hearts and minds that the thing which made them abandon their previous way of life and pulled them to this new way of life is the truth. Actually, truth gets revealed to them in this movement. It is this revelation which pulls them towards this movement. And the

special characteristic of the revelation of truth is that it doesn't allow man to remain at the same place where he was before the revelation, rather it slowly but gradually pulls him to a place where he sees the light of truth. It is because of this reason that the lives of those people, who acknowledge and accept the truth of this movement, change completely. They become totally different people. Such thoughts and words start to come out of their mouths which are unexpected of human beings in ordinary conditions. For the sake of their principles they even sacrifice their friendships and blood relations. They bear losses in their businesses, positions, interests and everything else even the hardships of imprisonment and get ready to go through the dangers of death. This revolution in their lives happens to be so comprehensive and overwhelming that their habits and traits get transformed even to the extent that the impact of this revolution is seen clearly on their faces, attire, food and ordinary way of living so much so that they get recognised by their style. Every person recognises them as supporters of this movement.

This is how every movement begins. It becomes a party with such people who rise up to run it. Its objectives and principles themselves sort out the people they are looking for from the crowd which is spread all over the world and they bring into the fold of this movement only those people who are in agreement with them.

After this comes another phase. Those who join this movement have this natural desire that their children too grow up in this way of life, a way of life which they accepted to be truth. For this purpose, they try to create impact on their new generation through education, upbringing, home life and outside environment so that the thoughts, morals, habits and traits are fashioned in accordance with the spirit and principles of this way of life. They achieve some success in this regard but it is only to an extent. Gaining total success is impossible. There is no doubt that education, upbringing, societal atmosphere and

family traditions play a huge role in shaping temperaments however, nature, bent of mind and natural predisposition are important things too and in reality, these are the fundamental things. Naturally, all kinds of people of all kinds of temperaments, inclinations and bents of mind have always been born in the world. Just as at the advent of this movement all kinds of people were there in the world and not everyone accepted it but rather only those were pulled towards it who were intellectually aligned with it, in the same way it cannot be expected that all those people who are the children of workers and supporters of this movement will inevitably align with this movement. There will be "Abu Jahl" and "Abu Lahb", "Omar ibn al-Khattab" and "Khaled ibn al Waleed." Just as Abraham, the monotheist was born in the house of Azar in the same way "an unrighteous conduct" could also be born and has been born in the house of Noah. According to the law of nature it is but inevitable that many such people must be born outside this society whose temperaments and inclinations should get aligned with it but there must be such people within the society itself who are not aligned with it. Therefore, it is not necessary that the system of education and upbringing created by the early supporters of the movement for their next generations must make them true followers of their way of life.

Two strategies are used to stop this danger and sustain the movement on its basic principles:

Those people who turn out useless despite the impact of education, upbringing and social atmosphere created by the movement be expelled from the party through "Takfir" and in this way the party is made free from inappropriate elements.

Continuous process of recruiting new people, whose mindsets and inclinations are aligned with that of the movement and to whom its principles and objectives appeal in the same way as they did to the early

* Current movements use the term "purge" for this process and all the parties do it to the people who are deemed inappropriate. Sometimes, those people are even killed who publicly deviate from the party's principles.

followers, into the party through preaching.

It is only these two strategies which can save a movement and a party from decline and decay. However, what happens is that gradually people get negligent to these two strategies. The efforts to recruit new people to the party starts to decline. The increase in the party membership gets solely relied upon increasing the number of children of the party members. And for the sake of blood relations, social relations and religious interests the party resorts to laxity to purge those useless people who are born into the party in this way. Through various excuses people try to seek out possibilities within the party policy to accommodate all kinds of worthless stuff and stretch the party ideology to such an extent that the signs of its boundaries and distinguishing limits cease to exist altogether. This reaches to a point where an assortment of people enters into the party who are totally inconsistent with the party's ideology, principles and objectives.

And then when the people consistent with the principles of the party decrease and those who are inconsistent with the party's principles increase, it starts to damage the social environment and the system of education and upbringing. Consequently, every new generation turns out to be worse than the previous generation. Every day, the party moves towards decline and decay. Until, there comes a time when the concepts of its ideology, principles and objectives, on which the party was initially launched, are totally lost. At this point, the party is now actually dead. And is replaced by an ethnic and social nationalism. The name which was initially used for the standard-bearers of a movement will now be used by those people who will destroy this movement and bring down its flag. The name which was associated with a mission and a principle will now be passed down from father to son like an inheritance regardless of whether or not the principles and objective of the scion have any relation with the name. In actuality, the name loses its meaning by reaching their hands. They themselves forget as well as the world that this name is associated with a certain mission, ideology

and principle; it is not meaningless.

Islam today has reached to this final stage. The people who are found today by the name of 'Muslims' have themselves forgotten this reality and their own conduct has made the world forget that Islam is actually a movement which is operating in the world with a mission and a principle. The term 'Muslim' was invented for the party which follows this movement and acts as its standard-bearer. The movement is lost, its mission is forgotten, its principles have been violated one by one and after losing all its meaning it is now used merely in the capacity of an ethnic and social nationalism. It is so outrageous that it is being brazenly used on those occasions too where the mission of Islam is openly flouted, its principles violated and where there is kufr (unIslam) instead of Islam.

Go to the markets. You will find "Muslim whores" in the brothels and "Muslim adulterers" making rounds. Inspect the prisons. You will be introduced to "Muslim thieves", "Muslim robbers" and "Muslim criminals." Pay visits to offices and court houses. You will find the word "Muslim" attached with bribery, perjury, fraudulence, oppression and all kinds of moral crimes. Walk around in the society. You will meet "Muslim drunkards" at one place, "Muslim gamblers" at some other place and at other places you will come face to face with "Muslim musicians", "Muslim singers" and "Muslim street performers." Just pause and think for a bit, how degraded this word "Muslim" has been made and with what attributes it is being bracketed. Muslim and adulterer! Muslim and drunkard! Muslim and gambler! Muslim and corrupt! If a Muslim were to do all those things a unbeliever does then what is the need for the existence of a Muslim in the world? Islam was the name of the movement which arose to eradicate all immoralities from the world. It created a party called Muslims out of a few selected individuals who are supposed to have impeccable character and be the standard-bearers of moral reform. The reason why it set the harrowing punishments of chopping the hand off, stoning to death,

lashing and even death penalty for its party members was because no adulterer be found in a party which stood up to eradicate adultery from the world, no drunkard be found in the party whose job is to put an end to alcoholism and no thief and robber be found in a party which seeks to stop stealing and robbery altogether. Its very mission was that those who are supposed to reform the world ought to be more virtuous, honourable and dignified than the rest of the world. That's why, let alone gambling, forgery, fraudulence and corruption not even Muslim musicians and singers were tolerated because these things are beneath the reformers of morality. What could be more disgraceful to an Islam which launched its movement with such severe obligations, strict discipline and which screened the crowd and recruited men and women of high moral calibre in its party, than the fact that the name "Muslim" is being attached to whore, gambler, thief and adulterer?! Could "Islam" and "Muslim" hold any regard in the world making heads bow to them in reverence and eyes struck with awe?!

This was an example of a lowly class of people. Above them is the educated class whose condition is even more unfortunate. This class believes that Islam is the name of ethnic nationality and any person born of Muslim parents is a Muslim at any rate even if he does not maintain a distant relationship with Islam as regards his creed, philosophy and way of life. If you were to go around in society you will come across all kinds of strange "Muslims" everywhere. At one place you will see a gentleman making fun of God and His Messenger openly and jeering at Islam and yet he is still a "Muslim." Another gentleman is an avowed denier of God, the prophethood and the Day of Judgement and professes firm belief in a materialistic philosophy of life but all these things do not make any difference in him being a "Muslim." A third gentleman earns interest and doesn't even consider giving zakat and yet he is still a "Muslim." And another honourable elderly gentleman has turned his wife and daughter into a "madam" or a "shrimati" taking them to the cinema or a dance festival or making

his daughter play violin in a music concert and yet the word "Muslim" is attached to him as usual. And another "good soul" is exempted from prayer, fasting, zakat, hajj and all other obligations; things like alcohol, adultery, bribery, gambling etc. have become lawful to him. His mind is not only free from making any distinction between lawful and unlawful but he doesn't even care to know what the law of God says in any matter? No difference whatsoever is found between him and a disbeliever and a polytheist in thoughts, words and actions but he is counted among the "Muslims." In short, when you inspect this so-called Muslim society, you will see an assortment of "Muslims"; you will find so many varieties of Muslims that you won't be able to count. This is a bird house containing eagle, vulture, quail, crow and hundreds of species of animals of which everyone is a "bird" of one variety or the other.

Interestingly, these people are not just content with deviation from Islam rather now their ideology is that whatever a "Muslim" says or does is "Islamic" even if he rebels against Islam it will be an Islamic rebellion. If they were to open banks then they would name it "Islamic bank." If they were to setup an insurance company then it would be an "Islamic Insurance Company." If they were to establish an educational institution indoctrinating Jahiliyyah (unIslamic concepts) then it would be called "Muslim University", "Islamic college" or "Islamic school." They would announce to the whole world that their "Kafir State" is an "Islamic state." Their Pharaohs and Nimrods would be remembered as "Islamic Emperors." Their unIslamic way of life would be declared "Islamic culture and civilisation." Their music, painting and idol-making will be given the honourable title of "Islamic art." Their atheism, agnosticism, heresy and absurd superstitions would be regarded as "Islamic philosophy." Even if they were to become Socialists, then they would be referred to as "Muslim Socialists." You are now acquainted with all their names, the only thing that remains now is that you also get acquainted with terms like "Islamic bar" and "Islamic casinos." The conduct of Muslims has rendered the word Islam so meaningless that

no one suspects any "contradiction in terms" in calling an unIslamic thing "Islamic kufr" or "Islamic sin." The truth is, if you were to see the board of "meat shop of the vegetarians" or "foreign local store" or "temple of monotheists" written on a building then perhaps you won't be able to control your laughter.

When this is the state of affairs of people's mentality then it is impossible for national interests and national policy to stay immune from this contradiction. What cries are you hearing everywhere in the papers, magazines, meetings and foundations run by Muslims and the Muslim intelligentsia as a whole? That we get reservations in government jobs. That this percentage of being cogs in the wheel be comprised of us in running an ungodly government. That we get at least a certain percentage of seats in the legislative assemblies. That our percentage should be such and such in

وَمَنْ لَّمْ يَحْكَمْ بِمَا أَنزَلَ اللَّهُ

Those who do not judge by what Allah has revealed... (Al-Maidah 5:44)

That our share should be the biggest in

وَالَّذِينَ كَفَرُوا يُقَاتِلُونَ فِي سَبِيلِ الطَّاغُوتِ

While those who disbelieve fight in the way of taqhut (Satan)

(An-Nisa' 4:76)

This is what the clamour is all about. This is what is called Islamic interests. Entire national politics of Muslims is rotating around this pivot. This group is now practically controlling the policy of the Muslim nation although not only do these things have nothing to do with Islam whatsoever rather, they are diagonally opposed to it. This is a point of reflection that had Islam been alive today as a movement then would its viewpoint be the same? Would any movement of social reform or any party which has the desire to establish government in the world based on its own principles allow its followers to be cogs in the wheel

of a government established on different principles? Have you heard any time that the communists have raised the question of communist interests in the system of the Bank of England? Or made the survival of communism contingent on their membership in the Fascist Grand Council?! If today, a member of Russian Communist Party were to become a loyal servant of the Nazi Government then can you expect he would be allowed to stay in the party even for a second? And if he were to join the Nazi Army and try to make Nazism supreme in the world then can you even hope for the safety of his life? But what are you seeing here? Contrary to Islam, which perhaps allows the consumption of a bread, earned unlawfully, only in emergency and forced circumstances, allows the bread to be swallowed with the condition of

غَيْرَ بَاغٍ وَلَا عَادٍ

...and he neither covets them nor exceeds the indispensable limits...

(Al-Baqarah 2:173)

and then emphasises that just as consuming pork is allowed only in severe starvation to save oneself from dying in the same way this bread should also be consumed just enough to survive, here not only is this bread being consumed with joy and merriment by rendering it

هَيِّئًا مَرِيَّةً

... (consume it) with good pleasure

(Al-Nisa' 4:4)

but also, it is over this that battles of Islam and Kufr (Disbelief) are fought and it is this which is considered to be the central point of the Islamic interest! After this, do not be shocked if the world were to make fun of Islam by hearing its claim to establish its rule as a moral and social way of life for the representatives of Islam themselves have sacrificed its esteem and its claim at the altar of their god of livelihood.

Now there is a gentleman of yours who has launched a military movement with pomp and show claiming to revive your past glory and

grant you domination in the land. Not thousands but millions of your people run to him. Millions pin their hopes of success and happiness on him. Your press backs him across the spectrum. And steadily, this gentleman becomes Islam's commander-in-chief and the community's leader. However, very few people of yours realise that his beliefs, understanding of the Quran, morals, speech, actions and methodology be scrutinised too. A man, veiled behind Islamic terminology, is presenting the ideologies of the likes of Machiavelli, Darwin, Heckel and Karl Pearson, destroying the very foundations of Islam by mixing natural law with moral law, is changing the definitions of faith, Islam, piety, worship, monotheism, prophethood, Jihad, Hijrah, obedience to the leader, community and everything else and you people are swallowing this poison down your throats merely over the greed that he will at least militarily organise the "Muslim nation" eventually. A man openly lies to you, builds the entire edifice of his movement on lies, disgraces Islam and Muslims before non-Muslims through his lies and falsehood, makes a mockery of the national morality of Muslims through his bad-mouthing and bragging, makes an apology at the very first strike confronting the non-Muslims, openly lies about apologising only to save his honour and boastfully goes to the same place where he had promised never to return again. You see all these things and yet run after him merely on the hope that he will take us to the peaks of success and happiness. Baseness, lowliness and vulgarity drip from the writings, speeches and every act of this man, not a grain of piety, truthfulness and dignity is visible in him and you lot do not even hesitate to accept his leadership. What's more outrageous is that he repeatedly offers the lives of 50,000 Muslims to be sacrificed for an ungodly government and the benefit he explains to you of this servitude of his is that at least you will receive military training as a result and your position will become strong. You gulp down this humiliating strategy too and delight in the illusion that you have at least found someone to militarily organise you. All these things are indicating

how lowly your standard of morality and humanity is! The Islam which you claim to represent came into this world to establish the principle that not only man's end ought to be pure but also the means. But the state of your moral affairs is that the moment you see any ray of hope in a means of attaining success you grab it by the teeth, no matter how impure and disgraceful it is. And you rip apart anyone who tries to stop you from it. Disregarding the purity and impurity of the means and focusing entirely on the end is the practice of atheists and disbelievers. If a Muslim were to adopt the same practice then what distinguishing feature would he have? Rather, after embracing this practice what would be the *raison d'être* for his existence as a Muslim?

Let us move higher up the ladder to your biggest National Assembly, the Muslim League which claims to represent 90 million Muslims. Take a look at the attitude and conduct it has adopted these days. In the beginning of the current war, read and read again the policy it has announced and then the opinion it expressed on the Viceroy's announcement. If you have the ability to differentiate between the conduct of a principle-oriented party and the conduct of a party formed purely to serve its nation's political ends then at the first glance itself you will realise that the policy adopted by the League during the war is free from any signs of adherence to principles. If it is accepted that in reality that this policy bespeaks the Muslim mind then anyone with eyesight could see in its light that Muslims are in moral rigour-mortis. If any other nation in the world was in the political situation in which the Muslims of India are locally then its league too would have adopted the same policy and composed its resolution in almost the same words. Instead of Muslim, you name it Sikh, Zoroastrian, German, Italian or any other name and apply this same political stance and these same local conditions to it and then you can quite easily attribute this resolution to any one of these nations. This means that Muslims have now fallen to a level at which all the other nations of the world are. A Muslim too is behaving in the same way as any other disbeliever or polytheist would

in any given circumstance. He has forgotten he is firstly and essentially a representative and advocate of a moral principle and it is in this capacity that he is named 'Muslim'. His job is to look at the moral aspect of any matter and him being a Muslim demand that he must base his decision on this ground. If he too were to only think about how the issue at hand is going to affect him and his people and how he could take advantage of such a situation then there remains no reason for him to exist as a "Muslim." He could have adopted such a practice even if he was a non-Muslim, untouched by any Divine Book.

I do not see this issue from the perspective of an Indian nationalist. I am not even concerned with whether this policy of Muslim League towards a people called Muslims living in India will be favourable or harmful. The only question which is important to me is that in what light the biggest assembly of the people which is considered to be the representative of Islam because of it being called Muslim today has presented Islam to the world? When I look at Muslim League's resolution from this angle, my soul mourns involuntarily. These people had an opportunity, a rare opportunity, to establish their moral superiority over all the nations of the world by virtue of being Muslims. They had a priceless chance to declare the truth that they are the adherents of a moral principle, that this principle carries the pure spirits of truth and justice and that this party is the only party in the world which works purely on morality above and beyond the concepts of personal or national gain. If the leaders of the League had even an iota of Islamic sensibility in them then they would not have lost this opportunity and compared to the respect gained, the loss that would have been expected to occur as a consequence of adopting this conduct would have been worthless. But unfortunately, from the Quaid-i-Azam of the League to its lowest followers, there is none who has an Islamic mindset and manner of thinking and who looks at matters from the Islamic perspective. These people do not accept the meaning and peculiar status of the Muslim at all. In their view, Muslims are a nation

just like the rest of the nations in the world and believe that merely safeguarding the interests of this nation through any possible political ploy and strategy is "Islamic Politics." When the truth is calling such an inferior politics as Islamic politics is nothing short of slander on Islam!

All of these few examples which I have presented to you from different aspects and areas of "Muslim" life point to only one conclusion that the Islamic Movement has now entered into the last phase of its decline and decay where the spirit of the movement gets totally lost and only its name remains which, as per "whose actions belie their name" gets applied to things which are against their true meanings. Ideologies unislamic but names Muslim, objectives unislamic but names Muslim, characters and conduct unislamic but the word Muslim slapped on them and behaviours unislamic but the word Muslim applied to them unabashedly. From individuals to organisations, from the lowest to the highest classes of society, from small associations to bigger ones, everywhere the signs and symptoms of this epidemic are visible. Often my heart asks this question: what took away the world-conquering and empire-building ability of Islam which once swept across the world like a storm with no power able to stand in its path? Every time, the answer I got to this question was the same law of decline and decay is being enforced on the Islamic Movement which I have explained in the beginning. There is no other way of reformation but to reignite and raise Islam as a movement and reinvigorate the meaning of Muslim. Those Muslims, whose hearts are still beating in this town of the dead and from the depths of which this testimony is rising up that Islam alone is the truth and mankind's success and salvation lies only in the Islamic way must know that this is the task which lies ahead of them. However, executing it is not a joke. This is a job the mere thought of which gives jitters.



Two Paths Before Muslims

THERE ARE TWO prerequisites for the health of any action, be it individual or collective:

The first condition is self-awareness. You must first learn what you are and also learn the requirements of being whatever you are. Then, if this research leads you to the revelation of a truth with which you do not agree i.e. you do not want to be what you are and rather be something else then even then it is necessary for you to determine what this "something else" is and properly understand the requirements of whatever it is that you want to be.

The second condition is will-power and decision-making power. In any case, you have to decide whether you want to remain whatever you are or are desirous to be something different. Then, in accordance with this decision, you must be ready to shoulder the burden of the requirements of whatever you want to be. Nothing could be more dangerous for an individual or a group that he loves one position but lusts after another, sometimes adhering to one position and then jumping to another but not ready to meet the demands of either of them. The inevitable consequence of this hesitation and indecisiveness is ineptness. Any person or group involved in it would become weightless in the world. He would not have any calm and stability. His situation would be that of a leaf on the ground carried away by the wind.

The more I have pondered the causes of indecisiveness and ineptness found in the conduct of Muslim individuals and their organisations the more convinced I have got that the root cause of all

these ills is the lack of these things: either self-awareness is lacking or will-power and decision-making power.

There is quite a sizeable section of people from amongst us which has absolutely no self-awareness. It would not even know what it means to be Muslim and what its requirements are? Then how can one be hopeful of it that it will choose a path for its individual and social conduct which Muslims ought to choose?

Another section of our populace, which is quite considerable too, does have self-awareness but lacks will-power and decision-making power. They know what they are and they also know what the requirements are of being whatever they are, however this knowledge created two kinds of emotions of love and fear in them. They want to stay whatever they are because they love what they are but they are also terrorised by the requirements of whatever they are. They know that being a Muslim is not a child's play. It comes with a heavy load of responsibilities. It comes with restrictions. It demands sacrifice and selflessness. It involves hard work and Jihad. It is a tough mission which entails fighting the whole world and seeking anything other than God's pleasure in return for this fight is not even lawful. The fear of this horrific thing is entrenched in their minds that they run away from the requirements of being Muslim and want to take a position which is easy. However, they do know that they cannot take any other position as long as they are Muslims. That's why their decision-making power gave up. They got caught perplexed between Islam and Kufr (Disbelief). They want to cling to Islam but run far away by looking at the horrifying face of its requirements. They leap towards the easiness, luxuries, pleasure and benefits of kufr but it says that if you want to come to me then you need to be total disbelievers and meet all my requirements. They are not even ready for this. And hence run away from this as well. They are now like a person who wanders around looking for comfort and advantages but is not prepared to accept the

responsibilities of any side.

Muslim community is mostly based on these two groups. That's why those social movements spreading among the Muslims are generally wrong from the Islamic perspective. Their objectives, methodology, leadership and spirit are all wrong. Many people do not realise this mistake because of their obliviousness. That's why they run these movements with excitement. In their view, a movement having the interests of Muslims at heart is enough to convince them that it is the right kind of movement.

الَّذِينَ ضَلَّ سَعْيُهُمْ فِي الْحَيَاةِ الدُّنْيَا وَهُمْ يَحْسَبُونَ أَنَّهُمْ مُجْسِنُونَ صُنْعًا

...and who believe nevertheless that they are doing good

(Al-Kahf 18:104)

And many people, who realise their mistake, support the movement out of their hidden psychological weakness because their ego has deceived them into thinking that safety lies in walking the middle path between Islam and Jahiliyyah. But the truth is that there is no such path and Muslims can be no where taking such a road. Therefore, true welfare of Muslims demands that the paths to Islam and Jahiliyyah along with their requirements and consequences be explained to them clearly and that they be advised to choose any one.

I have stirred a debate on the essential difference between "nation" and "party" in the Tarjuman-ul-Quran*. I have proved in this debate, with proofs from the Quran and the Hadith, that the group of people for whom the term "Muslim" was coined is not actually a "nation" but rather a "party." Now I want to explain in detail what the difference is between the requirements and consequences of being a "nation" and a "party." Neither I nor anybody else has the right to force

* See *Insight Into Islamic Thought-I* (Urdu: *Tafheemat*, vol 1), topic 'True Meaning of Islamic Nationalism.' For more details, refer to "The Question of Nationalism" (Urdu: *Masla-e-Qaumiyat*).

you to turn into a party from a nation. You have all the rights to become whatever you want. However, the service we can provide to you is the removal of confusion in the mind and blurriness in the sight so that you could correctly compare both the positions and that it becomes clear to you that the ways you are trying to think of to put together these two positions is wrong as per the principle and fatal as per the consequences.

The feeling of nationalism is born in a group of people due to historical consequences and the continuation of cultural legacy i.e. when some people live a life by a specific set of moral precepts, a specific kind of social mores, in mutual harmony distinct from other groups of people and when the next generation keeps on solidifying this heritage within itself, then they develop a sense of their separate social existence which is referred to as "nationality." There are certain habits and traditions with which they are familiar, certain thoughts which they love and which is interpreted by their literature. A collection of these things is called as their culture. They naturally have the desire to keep this culture i.e. the heritage of their forefathers alive and pass it on to their progeny so that the continuation of their national life is guaranteed.

In this sense, a group which has become a nation now and is awakened to the realisation that it is a nation, naturally will have the desire to hold the power to discipline its social life in its hands and to deter the imposition of any other group's will on it. This is the political interest of this group.

Likewise, they also want to protect the economic resources it has and acquire more resources if they are obtainable so that its members be more and more prosperous. This is what is described as the economic interest.

There is no reason to argue that as per the above-mentioned definition, Muslims have become a nation due to their centuries old

legacy and now maintain a separate social existence distinct from other groups. And there is no doubt in the fact that being surrounded by a huge population of other groups raises the question of the preservation of their political and economic interests and culture whose importance cannot be ignored. However, the question is: is this the only social status of Muslims? Are they nothing but a nation among the nations of the world? Is the importance of their nationhood only limited to the fact that they created "nationality" among themselves by living a certain kind of lifestyle generation after generation? Is the culture, which they call Islamic simply a collection of inherited traditions, customs and historical experiences? Are their national issues only confined to the conservation of the heritage they got from their forefathers and prevent the slipping away of the political authority and economic resources from their hands, resources which are still in their control, acquire more such resources needed for the prosperity of the people of their group and by and large keep the organisation of their social life in their hands?

If the nationality, culture and national issues of the Muslims are only these then undoubtedly all those national movements are right which are active among them in this form:

It is totally enough for them that there should be a league of theirs in which all those can come together on this platform who call themselves Muslims and are associated with the social system of Muslims. Few people from among them shall be their leaders on whose orders they shall march. And the goal of their entire struggle shall be to not lose whatever they still have and acquire anything more they could get their hands on regardless of whether Islam, in whose name they call their people Muslims, regards it lawful or unlawful. For them, all the importance should be dedicated to ensure that in any case, their people get enough slice in the governance and running of the country regardless of the kind of rule, so that they could keep their heritage

(culture) alive in whichever shape and form they want and gain a large chunk of whatever kind of benefits are being distributed in the population of the country.

For them, it is also appropriate to make deals, as per the circumstances, with any party on any terms, provided the deal takes the interests of their group into account*. In any matter, the question of national treason shall arise only when the deal is intentionally made disadvantageously or when the political and economic interests of the nation are ignored.

It is also legitimate for them that there should be nationalism in them too just as it is there in other nations. That they too should make demands for world-domination just like Italy, Germany and Japan. They too be organised on fascist lines. That according to natural selection and survival of the fittest, they too ought to prove themselves the "fittest" like a wolf and start devouring unfit sheep. That they too be bracketed with imperialists, attain world-domination in any possible way and create the pleasures of

جَنَّاتٍ تَجْرِي مِنْ تَحْتِهَا الْأَنْهَارُ

...that for them are gardens beneath which rivers flow

(Al-Baqarah 2:25)

in this world life and on this earth.

After adopting this ideology of nationalism, everything is right and appropriate for you. But know this well that Islam has nothing to do with this nationalism. Islam is neither interested in any racial group nor is attached to the hereditary traditions and customs of any party. It neither looks at the issues of the world from the viewpoint of few individuals or a group of individuals or the interests of a group of individuals nor has it come to add one more nation with its name to the list of nations into which mankind is divided. Neither does it want to

* Whether it is the Congress Party, the Socialist Party or any other party.

turn human groups into animals that they may enter the competition of the survival of the fittest and take part in the test of natural selection. All this is unIslamic. So, if this is what your nationhood, culture and national interests are then give whatever name you want to give to your nation but you do not have the right to use the name of Islam because Islam disassociates itself from your nationalism and culture. And I don't understand your insistence on using Islam's name? You are totally unconcerned with the meaning of "Muslim." All you need is just a name for your nationhood. So, whatever name you coin for yourselves to this end, it will denote your separate social status just as the word "Muslim" is denoting right now. After all, what is so special about this kind of nationhood that only the word "Muslim" has to be used for it?

The need to change this name is warranted not only because this ideology of yours upon which you are basing your nationhood is against Islam but also because whatever you do with your ideology, will bring shame and disgrace to Islam. The world watching you will assume that this is what Islam teaches and this thing will further push it away from Islam. You will try to maintain your percentage in a non-Islamic army to protect your "national interests" and the world will say that probably this is what the teaching of Islam is that you will be willing to slit the throat of everyone who gives you a salary of Rs. 15/- a month. For the sake of national interests, you will hold on to every advantage by the teeth which a Muslim or lots of Muslims can have in whichever they can and the world will attribute this depravity to Islam. On one hand you back a thing with total disregard to principles because it is in your interest and on the other hand oppose it because it is against your interest; you ally yourselves with one party on one hand but then on the other hand you fight with it not because there is any essential agreement or unity between the two of you but because it is not the principle but "national interest" which is in your sight. This opportunism of yours which shall be displayed by your character will lead the world to believe that this is a character Islam produces. You

shall run everywhere in search of national interest. You shall even adopt fascist principles or communist ideology or oppressive Capitalism or seek refuge in the arms of dictatorial states. Be it the British, the Hindu or many states of India, you shall bow to any idol you would find. And all these blemishes will be laid on Islam because of you. The so many favours which Islam has done to you since centuries should at least not be returned in this way that you bring disgrace to it.

But if you truly love Islam and want to stay Muslim then you must know that Islam is not an ethnic religion like Judaism and Hinduism which creates an ethnic nationhood rather it is a moral and social way of life for the whole mankind. It is a world-theory and a universal idea. It creates a party which takes up this way of life, this idea, this concept and practically presents its scheme and structure to the world and includes anyone accepting it into its party regardless of his or her nationality to the extent that the wall dividing the nations is demolished. In its view, "Islamic" is only that which is in accordance with its way and ideology and it clearly refuses to accept anything which is against it even if the personal interest of all the Muslims of the world was associated with it. Therefore, if you were to live for Islam's ideology and strive to make it supreme in the world then you shall certainly be the Islamic party and a Muslim group otherwise Islam shall not have any relation with you whatsoever if you were to live for your own self and strive for your own interest. You have absolutely no right to work for yourself and take Islam's name.

After understanding universal and global nature of the Islamic way, you also need to understand what the requirements of a world-theory and a universal idea are?

Firstly, it doesn't content itself with staying just a party among various other parties. Rather, its nature demands that it should be the only party. It is not ready to make any rival power its equal. Showing hospitality and making compromises is impossible for it. It does make deals but rather want to be dominant.

لِيُظْهِرَهُ عَلَى الدِّينِ كُلِّهِ وَلَوْ كَرِهَ الْمُشْرِكُونَ

...that He may make it prevail over all religions, howsoever those who associate others with Allah in His Divinity might detest it

(At-Tawbah 9:33 and As-Saff 61:9)

Secondly, it does not look at issues and problems from the viewpoints of individuals, classes or nations rather it takes a comprehensive and universal view of things. It is absolutely not concerned with in what lies the benefit of that person or class or group. It is concerned with the human being and it wants to solve those problems which in their collective capacity are required to be solved for man regardless of who gets what and who loses what.

كُنْتُمْ خَيْرَ أُمَّةٍ أُخْرِجَتْ لِلنَّاسِ

You are now the best nation brought forth for mankind

(Al-Imran 3:110)

Thirdly, it doesn't have temporary and regional objectives in its view. Rather, it keeps its eyes on a permanent and universal goal which is to demolish the system of life that is established in the world against its principle and establish a separate world order as per its own principles.

Fourthly, it is not ready to be within the narrow confines of nationalism which is based on ethnic and historical traditions. Pulling better and good individuals from all the human beings of its era towards its organisation and making them work for itself is the essential prerequisite for its success. If it were to become the supporter of the personal interests of a certain nation then obviously its appeal to other nations would be rendered ineffective.

Fifthly, it doesn't attach itself to the hereditary culture, traditions and customs of a specific nation rather it grabs all the truths – not theories but truths – discovered as a result of the intellectual quest and curiosity by the human world in every era or the good conclusions

produced due to the human endeavour and imbibes them in its social system in accordance with its principles so that they may become the natural – not imported – parts of its system.

Sixthly, for its success, it is not enough to prove that it is true in itself and that mankind's salvation lies in it. Rather, to achieve its goal, it demands that its principles be made the basis of a movement. Believers in it should emerge as a warrior party on the strength of this movement and in the end its views become the fundamental laws of a state.

These are the prerequisites of Islam and the Muslims as well. Now, if you want to work as an "Islamic Party" then you need to review this national policy of yours which you are still following. You need to change them totally and mould yourselves according to these prerequisites.

You need to cast away the idea of national interest from your mind and give that place to the principles and mission of Islam. You need to ignore temporary and local objectives and focus on the goal of making the principles of Islam reign supreme in the world. For this purpose, you need to be ready to fight the whole world and you won't be able to make any deal with any party that doesn't agree with your principles. You have to become a party totally committed to your principles whose slogan would be to separate those people from yourselves who do not accept your principles and sift through all the nations and recruit those good people who are willing to accept these principles. You need to renounce opportunism. You cannot do anything apart from your principles no matter how big the personal and national benefit lies in it. You have to become a warrior party which fights for its principles, whose goal is not the establishment of its "national state" but rather an "ideological state."

When you become such a party then you need to change your leadership. At that time, your leaders could only be those who correctly know the principles of Islam and most ardently follow them as well. A

leader of a nation can only be he who is a member of that nation. But the leader of a party can only be he who is the biggest champion of the ideology of the party. In a national setup even those who are deviated from the Islamic ideology can get a prominent place but, in a party-setup they shall have the lowest ranks. In fact, many of them could not even get a place in any row.

قَدْ تَبَيَّنَ الرُّشْدُ مِنَ الْغَيِّ

The Right way stands clearly distinguished from the wrong

(Al-Baqarah 2:256)

Both the paths have been made clear to you. Now, make a comparison between the benefits and harms of both the paths so that making a decision becomes easy.

If you are only a nation which strives for its own personal interests then you will be like an immobile rock and there are many such nations in the form of rocks like you. You will be compared to them like a rock is compared to other rocks. One rock cannot increase its thickness by taking parts from other rocks nor can it enter into the capacity of another rock. There are only two ways of anything happening between the two: either every rock should be content with staying in its own territory or one rock collides with another rock and tries to break it into pieces and grinds it to powder. In the first case you will get restricted and in the second case you have the possibility of expansion but the kind of expansion fascist Italy and Nazi Germany are gaining now which was already gained by imperialist Britain before them. Similarly, by gaining expansion you will be just adding yet another mischief-mongering nation to the list which would spread mischief in the land for a while and get payback at the end for its crimes.

Contrary to this, if you become a party dedicated to its principles in accordance with Islam which strives only for an ideology and a world-theory and every human being can take part in it with equal rights and in equal capacity by accepting this principle of yours then

you will not be an immobile rock but rather a growing body. You will be like a tree which keeps expanding by taking up and imbibing all the nutrients from its surrounding. In this scenario, you will be a world-force. You will try to conquer the world not for yourselves but for a true principle and if your principles are appealing to human nature and capable of solving mankind's problems (which they actually are) then the world will present itself to you to be conquered. There is no universal attraction in your personal and national interest. If you were to invite to it then the world will never turn to it rather you have to force the world to turn to it. However, there is the power of universality in the principles of Islam. The world will turn to it on its own provided you live and die for your principles. You have the example of communism before you. It became a world-force because the communists were not fighting for their own interests but for the principles of communism. If they were to stop fighting for communism and only concern themselves with the interests of the communists then you will see the end of the world-conquering power of communism.



Majority and Minority

SINCE THE MUSLIMS turned their religion into an inert national culture instead of a global movement and themselves into a mere nation instead of an international revolutionary party, consequently we are now witnessing that for the first time ever in history a Muslim is now faced with the question of majority and minority and he now finds himself in a predicament that with regards to headcount, his ratio is one to four and so how can he save himself from the hegemony of people who are four times more than him in numbers?!

This predicament is gradually turning into a defeatist attitude and like a weak party to a dispute a Muslim is unable to figure out any strategy other than recoiling and shrinking back into its own shell. The singular reason for this situation is that the poor fellow neither has any idea of the power he has in the form of Islam nor is aware of what his status is in the world by virtue of being a Muslim? He deems his religion to be a blunt weapon and himself a "nation" and that is why he is concerned about his safety. Had he remembered that he is a party and a party whose mission is to conquer the world by the power of his ideology, way of life and social philosophy then he never would have faced this difficulty. The question of majority and minority would never have risen for him. He would have never been worried about withdrawing into his own shell. Rather, he would have contemplated about ways to win the battle.

The question of majority and minority rises only for nations not "parties." Those parties which rise up with a powerful ideology

and forceful social philosophy are always less in numbers and despite their low numbers rule over huge majorities. The Communist Party of Russia has only 3.2 million members and was even lower at the time of the revolution but it conquered 170 million human beings. Mussolini's Fascist Party has only 400,000 members and it was 300,000 when it marched on Rome but this small number overpowered 45 million Italians. This exactly is the case with the Nazi Party of Germany. If the examples from the past Islamic history are to be given here then they can get shelved under the excuse that that era has passed now and the circumstances have changed. However, these fresh examples are available right in this era of yours which prove that minority can rule even today provided it strives like an ideological party and instead of fighting for limited goals it should fight for principles which are capable of solving the life-problems of people and drawing their attention to it.

To this end, the principles of Islam can provide the best programme and if Muslims were to rise up to this occasion of striving to practically implement this programme then the circumstances can change in few years. But the people in whose hands lies the leadership of the Muslims are neither acquainted with Islam nor perceive themselves as Muslims, nor are they aware of the source wherein lies Islam's conquering power. The greatest heights of thought their brains can reach is either to worry about running to their secure fortresses by seeing themselves to be a minority or come to the conclusion that they have no other choice but to follow others and give themselves up to the leadership of non-Muslims.

Of all the parties in power today in the world, there is not one whose membership crosses millions. Probably, Russia's Communist Party is the biggest today. However, as I have said just now, even its members are not more than 3.2 million. If it is looked at from this angle then it must be said that the number of the believers in an ideology is 80 million in just one country and 400 million across the globe deserves to be the ruler of the world. This could certainly have

been the outcome had the realisation of they being a party dawned on them, had they comprehended their party's mission and had they readied themselves to strive for this mission. The thing which rendered this great population totally ineffective and absolutely useless is the absence of this very realisation and readiness to act. Different kinds of satanic forces have attached themselves to it and are constantly trying that it doesn't get to know itself and that it doesn't wake up to its mission. Inspect the conditions of Muslims of India from east to west and north to south, everywhere you will see that one or the other devil is after the life of this people and is engrossed in its work with total alacrity. Where Muslims still have any kind of interest in the religion there these devils appear in the cloak of religiosity and stir debates, disputes, sometimes even leading to violence, in the name of religion on those issues that have no importance in the religion. In this way, entire religious zeal of the Muslims is wasted on their own destruction. And where any indifference is shown by the religion there some other kind of devils emerge and by showing them the dream of "The Promised Land" of worldly development and prosperity they pull Muslims to movements which are totally unIslamic as regards their objectives and methodology.

Those people, who had the chance to watch the condition of the Muslim people, know that even in this "dead and buried" condition Muslims still have quite sufficient moral strength, by which a lot could be done. However, all these numerous illnesses afflicting this nation have thrown this great population of 800 million to the level zero. They have been far removed from the objective for which Islam demands Jihad, hard work and sacrifice. The right concept of Islam and the true meaning of Muslim have been removed from their minds. They have actually been rendered strangers to themselves. The Islam which is found in them today has no future and no chance of success.

Due to these reasons this enormous population which can be seen in the census registers is now almost useless for Islamic objectives.

If anything is done by relying on this population then it will be met with serious disappointment. The thing which can be expected of them, more or less, is that if Islam were to rise up again as a living movement and compete against the satanic forces for the establishment of the rule of its principles then perhaps it might get more volunteers from the Muslims compared to the non-Muslims with relative ease.

Now, those people who actually know and understand that Islam which was revealed to Prophet Muhammad (Peace be upon him) and whose hearts are totally convinced that the success and salvation of humanity lie in the rule of this very Islam and it is only upon the principles of Islam that a balanced and fair system of civilisation and society can be built, they need to clear their minds of some of the misconceptions and fully understand some of the realities:

First, attaching "Muslim interest" to Islam is a mistake. In Islam's view, this question of how many Muslims are being used in the service of the armed forces and how many are serving in the police and civil services, and how many seats they have won in legislative assemblies so that they too could act as law makers just like the non-Muslims in God's country and in what states the seats of power have been reserved for Muslim rulers so that they too could become illegitimate owners of God's country like the non-Muslim kings carries no importance nor Islam acknowledges such an "interest" from its followers. Calling these kinds of questions Islamic is an affront to Islam. And Islamic Movement ought to be totally unconcerned with all these kinds of questions.

Second, the success of Islam is neither dependent on the numbers and strength of those Muslims who are now registered in the census as Muslims nor the enormity of the number of Hindus and other non-Muslims acts as any strong impediment in Islam's path to success. Assessing the strength of Islam in India by looking at the percentage of Muslims and non-Muslims in the census registers and assuming

that the strength of Islam is directly proportional to the percentage of Muslims in the population and thinking that the possibility of Islam's success is slim if the percentage of non-Muslims in the population is more is the work of only those people who know Islam merely as an inert religious tradition. If Islam were to enter the arena as a living and practical movement and an organised party were to rise up with a practical programme based on Islam's principles to solve the real issues of Indian life then believe me its appeal would not be limited to hereditary Muslims only rather perhaps it would attract the non-Muslims to it more than the Muslims and there will not be any power which could stop this flood. Those people today who see that the only way to protect Islam is to gather Muslims from everywhere and deliver them to a safe haven are sadly not aware of the possibilities of Islam.

Third, the success of any movement is not dependent on whether the strength of its true believers and followers reach 60 or 70 percent in the country. Historical events and experiences of our current world tell us that a strong and organised party, whose members have full faith in their movement, and are willing to sacrifice their lives and wealth in its cause and strictly adhere to party discipline, can come to power merely by the dint of their faith and discipline regardless of its members being only one in one thousand in the country's population. Millions find the party's programme appealing and the party gains the sympathy of the millions, however only those stay in the party who are at the highest levels of faith and obedience. Therefore, there is no need for a large number of true Muslims to make Islam supreme in the world, few are enough provided they are Muslims in their knowledge and conduct and are ready to wage Jihad in God's way with their lives and property.



Complaints

ONE OF THE READERS of Tarjuman-ul-Quran writes:

"In your opinion, there is none in the current leadership or the public who is worthy of calling himself or be called as a Muslim, nor the struggle for the welfare of these so-called Muslims in the contemporary political conflict. Then, for God's sake tell us by what name this Muslim should be called or is there any need for a strategy to save himself from the attacks which are being made against him from all the sides?

It is true that the Muslims of present times are bad. They do not adhere to the religion. However, should they be allowed to keep drowning? Should one not call oneself Muslim until all have joined the straight path and should there not be a struggle on the part of this kind of Muslims for their own good? To say to the one drowning that why the hell did you even enter into the deep waters and you are not worthy of sympathy is totally inhuman. The need is to rescue him out and every step be taken to save him."

Another gentleman writes:

"Your attitude has become a great cause of concern to me and so many other people who share my thoughts. As long as you kept criticising the nationalist Muslims or the Muslims cooperating with the Congress, we thought that you are in support of maintaining the individuality of Muslims in India that's why you differ with those whose attitude has alarmed you that individuality of Muslims will get lost. However, you have started to criticise these two movements and their leaders as well who are striving to protect this individuality i.e.

Muslim League and Khaaksaar movement. Now, we don't understand as to what you want after all? If the Muslims want to stay alive in India then it is necessary for them at any rate to assemble at any central point, become an organised group and move under someone's leadership. What does your opposition to the efforts to achieve this objective mean? If you want the revival of religiosity then it can happen only when a social system of the Muslims is created. At the moment, be it good or bad, at least a party is being made and you should support it. Then struggle all you want to revive religiosity. But your attitude shows that you don't want to back any efforts that are being made for the success and welfare of the Muslims."

These two letters are the overall representatives of many letters of complaint which I had received for the past few days. A big chunk of our educated people is currently thinking on these lines and this way of thinking has been exhibited in these letters.

There is no doubt criticising oneself and taking stock of one's weaknesses is not a propitious thing to do – I too do not do this thinking it to be a pleasant thing. It's a very bitter drink, a cup of poison which I am swallowing it down my throat, feeling the full bitterness of this drink as has been felt by fellow brothers of mine. Notwithstanding this realisation, my conscience urges that instead of avoiding, this bitterness must be endured. The bitterness is real. The benefit of indifference to it is nothing but the suspension of one's comprehension of true and real bitterness. To complain against the tyranny and ruthlessness of others and ignore one's own weaknesses and mistakes rather search for arguments of justification and approval in favour of them is quite a pleasant thing to do by which the heart is amused but it is just like an injection of morphine. It's a drug which causes sleepiness in the patient but does not cure his internal troubles because of which external hardships gained sway over him. My brothers want me as well to give them such injections of morphine. They desire that I let the fictional heaven, in which they live, the hopes which they have pinned

on getting the springs of the life-giving water from the mirages, the misconceptions and the alluring talisman that they have created around themselves and all these things as it is. Rather, they want me to join them for whom commending these things has become the greatest service to the religion and the community. I am also aware of the benefits of this service however I am helpless that I prefer to be an awful friend than an awesome enemy.

جانتا ہوں ثواب طاعت وزہد
پر طبیعت ادھر نہیں آتی

"I know the virtues of obedience and devotion

However, my temperament has no inclination"

Interest of Muslims, welfare of Muslims, organisation of Muslims, association and centrality of Muslims, development and prosperity of Muslims, these are the things which are often repeated. I too mention them and so does every Tom, Dick and Harry and everyone else who is included in this group and presents his case in these very words. However, there is a difference in our pathways, regardless. One is going in one direction, the other is going in another direction and the third in a different direction altogether. What is the reason for this after all? Is it just coincidental? Or is there a fundamental cause lying at the core of this problem which we are not trying to understand?

In my view, the reason for this is that the words that we use are common to us but we differ in their meaning and import. The word "Muslim" is the same but I understand it in a different way and others mean it to be something else. Because of this difference every word like interest, welfare, prosperity, organisation, association, centrality, growth and development which are used with reference to the word Muslim have come to mean differently to each and every one of us. Because of this confusion, misunderstandings occur and when people become helpless in trying to solve them a series of complaints begins.

They begin to say that you have no sympathy for the interests, welfare, prosperity and development of Muslims. An association is being formed and a centrality in the Muslim community is being created but you on the other hand are opposing it. Works for the betterment of Muslims are being undertaken and you are creating obstacles in the path. When the truth of the matter is, that those specific and well-defined things to which these words are being applied by one person cannot be applied in another person's view otherwise obviously what disbeliever would be antagonistic to the welfare of Muslims?

Let us analyse what kind of confusion is this? The difference between 'unconditional' and 'conditional' is so obvious that it can be understood by everyone. When we use a word, which is unconditional and general, then it will have a wider usage. And when we make it conditional then using the word without taking its conditionality into account wouldn't be right. For instance, when we say the word "colour" it will be used for every colour. When this colour gets stronger, be it black, white or red, we say that its colour is darkening. However, when we specify the colour by saying white then all other colours like black, red, green etc. get automatically excluded and hence to regard the darkening of the white as darkening of black or red would be wrong. Similarly, take the word "caravan" for instance. The word caravan can be used for any caravan going in any direction. To anywhere it advances, its advancement can be called the advancement of the caravan. Any person can become the leader of this caravan, any person can travel in any one of its carriages, any person can carry any kind of provisions for the journey, in short because of being related to the "root", all those things which are related to it will be deemed unconditional as well. However, when for example by putting the condition of "journey to Peshawar" if it is called "Peshawar caravan" then that generality will not be there anymore which used to be when it was just a caravan. "Caravan Peshawar" will be applied to only that caravan which is

making a journey to Peshawar. It cannot be that it is going to Madras or Bombay but be called Caravan Peshawar. Likewise, all those things related to it will come under the conditionality of Peshawar. For example, the advancing of Caravan Peshawar would mean that it is on the road leading to Peshawar. If it is moving on any other road then it will not be considered the advancement of Caravan Peshawar rather it will instead be called regression, because the more steps it takes on this road will take it farther and farther away in relation to its destination which is the city of Peshawar. Only he can be the leader of this caravan who knows the direction to Peshawar. Regardless of the expertise of a person on any other directions, if he is unacquainted with the directions to Peshawar then he in no case can become the leader of Caravan Peshawar. This is applicable to all other matters as well.

Now see how the confusion is caused. Let us once again use the example of the caravan. Although the name of the caravan is 'Caravan Peshawar' however you either forget the condition of 'Peshawar' and deem it to be just any caravan or you do not know the directions to Peshawar or you think that once the people of this caravan are designated as "Caravan Peshawar" they must at any rate be called "Caravan Peshawar" even if they travel in whichever direction they want except for Peshawar. Contrary to this, I understand Caravan Peshawar for what it actually means and I am not ready to ignore the condition of 'Peshawar' associated with it. The consequence of this disagreement is that the more we discuss this caravan the more we fight. As long as the discussion stays abstract and abridged, we stay in agreement. The dispersed travellers of the caravan should be brought together, they should not be allowed to lose themselves in other caravans, they should be protected from highway robbers, provisions for their journey should be arranged, they need a leader for their caravan, they should make progress towards their destination in an organised manner...as long as all these things are said vaguely and abstractly, you and I keep agreeing. However, when the time to determine these things comes, we find

that the distance between your thoughts and my thoughts is like the distance between east and west. One person comes along, assembles the travellers of this caravan and takes them to Bombay. Another person comes along and takes them on the road to Calcutta. A third person comes along and leads them in a totally different direction. Seeing the banner of every leader of the caravan, you start raising the slogan of 'Long Live' and cry in excitement that the "Caravan Peshawar" has kicked off. I precisely object to this misdirected excitement that this assembly of people and this progress is not the assembly and progress of "Caravan Peshawar." You say that at least the dispersed travellers are coming together and at least a caravan is taking shape. I say that this is all true and correct, however only the assembly of people and the shaping up of the caravan do not mean the shaping up of the "Caravan Peshawar." You say that 'look, what a fast-moving and fantastic carriage in which this caravan is moving'. I say that there is no denying of your descriptions but to where is this carriage going? If it is not moving in Peshawar's direction then the caravan is not suitable to be called Caravan Peshawar. In this case, its speed is even more dangerous for day by day it will keep taking the caravan farther and farther away from its destination. You say that let there be a leader of the caravan and let him drive the carriage and then the road to Peshawar can be taken as well. I say that as long as "destination Peshawar" remains absent and you are steadily moving in other directions, you need to change the name. I do not have any objection to the moving of your carriage rather I object that you move in the direction of Madras or Calcutta but call it Caravan Peshawar. You say that the road to Peshawar is quite difficult and going there is impossible therefore, let the Caravan Peshawar move in other directions at the least. I say that when did I ever insist on dragging you to the difficult road? My only intent was that driving Caravan Peshawar in other directions and still calling it Caravan Peshawar is a contradictory thing to say. All I request you to do is to admit to and fix this contradiction.

In all of this discussion, the basis of the dispute is that you turn the conditional into unconditional and free all things associated with it from this conditionality whereas I regard the conditional as conditional. If you were to clear your mind and understand the difference between an unspecified caravan and Caravan Peshawar then there won't be any confusion. However, instead of understanding a simple thing in a simple way you steer the discussion towards other things. Sometimes you say that I am against the assembling, organising and advancing of the caravan. But the truth is what disbeliever has ever denied the existence of assembly, organisation and advancement? Sometimes you ask that if this caravan is not Caravan Peshawar then what should it be called. When the truth is, suggesting its name is not my responsibility. My point is clear. If it is on the road to Peshawar then it is Caravan Peshawar. And if it is not, then propose any name you like but calling it Caravan Peshawar is not right. If you want you can even discuss whether or not this road leads to Peshawar? But you have to admit this principle that if it is not on the road to Peshawar then it should not be called Caravan Peshawar. Then you raise the question of sympathy when the truth is this debate has nothing to do with sympathy or cruelty. As a matter of fact, this is a question of truth. How could I ever say that those going to Madras or Calcutta are 'travellers to Peshawar'? What kind of sympathy is to knowingly declare something totally false as true? Sympathy to me is that people must be told clearly that this is the road to Peshawar and these other roads go in different directions. Those who actually want to go to Peshawar but have strayed into other roads due to their lack of knowledge of the actual direction or they have been misled should find out the correct direction and those who want to actually go in other directions, I neither want to stop them nor have I any animosity towards them so as to commit inhumane cruelty against them. My only objective is that wherever they want to go they should do that with proper understanding and realisation and when they do go, they should not travel with wrong and misleading names.

The confusion that is being created with regards to Muslims is exactly the same which is described in the above example. The word Muslim is derived from Islam and Islam is the name of a mode of thinking, a purpose of life, a character and a conduct. From this aspect, the word Muslim doesn't denote just a person but rather a person who practices a certain style of thinking, has a specific purpose and a distinct conduct in all affairs of life which is called Islam. If the specifications of the word Muslim are clearly and properly understood then the meanings of interest, welfare, organisation, leadership of Muslims, in short everything related to the Muslims will get established. However, by disregarding these specifications if the word Muslim is unconditionally taken to mean only a group of people then every person has the freedom to declare anything as 'interest of the Muslims', call anything 'welfare of the Muslims', understand any kind of organisation as the 'organisation of the Muslims' and whoever is found to have the ability to drive a human herd by its noose be declared as the 'leader of the Muslims'.

Unfortunately, this is what the situation is right now. "Muslims" are now being understood to denote only a group of individuals regardless of the condition of "Islam" and it is because of this reason that the interests of the Muslims, their welfare, organisation, association, leadership etc. are being applied to strange things. For instance, they say that Muslim interest lies in modern banking, insurance and taking advantage of these kinds of things. When the truth is if the word Muslim carries any meaning then according to that meaning Muslims are appointed to destroy this entire financial system which is so well-established in our times and replace it with a system based on their principles. If this is not indicative of mental confusion then what is that you deem your interests associated with the system with which you have a quintessential animosity and then name it "interests of the Muslims"?! Likewise, government jobs, legislative assembly seats and other such things are described as "interests of the Muslims." When the

fact is if the word Muslim is subjected to the condition of Islam then all these things will turn out to be against the interests of the Muslims. If you truly care about the interests of the Muslims then you should work to change the current system of governance the running of which you misunderstand to be the interests of the Muslims. Similarly, you think that preparing the minds of your youth under the education system setup by the British is the way to progress and prosperity, and you spend your own money to setup schools and colleges under this system and dare to name them 'Islamic school', 'Islamic college' and 'Islamic university' when the fact of the matter is that this entire system of education shapes mankind as per a scheme which is diametrically opposed to the Islamic scheme.

You are similarly mistaken about the association, organisation and leadership of the Muslims. If you were to know what kind of a movement Islam is, what its goal is, what its principles are and what kind of conduct it wants then you can easily judge for yourselves the true nature of these political associations, organisations and leaders which are currently working in the name of Islam. According to Islam, the only association of Muslims is that which establishes the rule of God by destroying an ungodly government and which strives to make the divine law supreme. Any organisation which doesn't do this and in fact strives for the worldly interests of a people by the name of "Muslim" living under an ungodly system is neither an Islamic party nor calling it the party of Muslims would be right. In the same way, the organisation of Muslims can be only that which is solely based on the Islamic principles of society and whose objective is Islamic. An organisation which is formed on fascist principles and whose objective is the domination and empowerment of its people cannot be called organisation of the Muslims based merely on the fact that it organises the Muslims of census reports and is endeavouring to conquer the world. On these same lines, only those people can be the leaders of Muslims who, first and foremost, are well aware of the goal, principle and methodology of

the Islamic Movement and are men of piety and integrity. As for those rest of the people who have no knowledge of Islam whatsoever or mix up Islam and Jahiliyyah (unIslam) based on their defective knowledge and are devoid of even the basic prerequisites of piety and integrity then considering them to be worthy of Muslim leadership just because they are experts in western politics or western style of organisation and are totally drowned in their love of their nation is moving away from Islam to Jahiliyyah and unIslamic mindset.

When these things are told to the Muslims in a clear and frank way, they get annoyed and create a mountain of complaints. But in reality, there is no place for getting incensed in this matter. People need to think cool-headedly and decide whether they want to work for Islam on Islamic principles or for themselves on their own principles. If it is the first, then they should straightforwardly need to ditch all those things which are unIslamic, however if it is the second, then they can do whatever they want to do, we will not stand in their way. The only thing we demand from them is that they stop misusing the names of Islam and Muslim.



The Path Backwards

TWO KINDS OF PEOPLE always function in the world. Those who accept the situation as it is and operate accordingly and those who view the situation from the angle of what it should be and criticise the current system of governance from this viewpoint. The first kind drives the 'car' of the present and the second kind clears the path for the reformation and growth of the future. Cooperation between these two kinds is important; however the only way they could cooperate naturally is through mutual conflict.

Those who keep their eyes on "what is" are always infatuated with the present. They say that whatever is happening is good and hence, there is no room for criticism. And if at all there is any, for the sake of argument, then it is neither the time nor the place because criticisms at such a point of time will create such and such mischief and hurt such and such interests. They say all these things because their vision is perplexed by temporary interests and immediate benefits. Their love for the immediate and the short-term did not give them any chance to think about the later (the hereafter) and the long-term. If looked at from their point of view then there cannot be any time suitable for criticism because anything happening at any time is good. Every time, there will be one or the other temporary interests ready to be hurt. Every time, they would say by taking the sensitivity of the interests into account that now is not the time for criticism. But the truth is they themselves could not say what time would be appropriate for criticism.

On the other hand, since those who have their eyes set on "what

should be" view the circumstances from a different perspective, they regard the current moment to be the perfect time for criticism, something which is extremely unsuitable in the eyes of "people of the present." The critics have to do their job under the screams, abusive words and pleas of "fans of the present" because if they do not do it then reformation and growth would not be possible. Obviously, the need for any kind of reformation cannot be felt when the mentality of "whatever is happening is good" takes over the common people. Either they will not have any realisation of shortcomings so that they could focus on correcting them or even if there awakens a small realisation then these "patrons of the present" will start giving all kinds of explanations to suppress it so as to prove their shortcomings as inevitable and turn them into strengths if they could.

The consequence of the criticism made from the perspective of "what should be" is never that whatever is happening in the present should be stopped all at once and should remain in a state of limbo until that ideal condition doesn't emerge which the critic regards as the ultimate objective. This has never happened nor will it ever happen. Naturally, the impact of criticism is always gradual. In the beginning, it is seen with bitterness and disdain for general temperaments of the people are inclined to cash and averse to credit. Then the period of suspicions comes wherein every possible thing is attributed to the critic except for truthfulness and sincerity. Afterwards, if there is really any strength in the criticism and the shortcomings are actually found in the current system as were pointed out in the criticism and the spirit of the common people too truly accept this very criterion to be true which the critic had kept in mind while criticising, then slowly and gradually people begin to realise the importance of reformation. And as and when the public opinion is formed in its favour, the pressure on the leadership of the time increases until either the previous leaders had to change their policy or due to the demand from the changed circumstances a new leadership emerges fully grown. During this process, no gap

or crack is formed in the pace of history which would give rise to the situation of suspension and deadlock the horrifying picture of which the "people of the present" are frequently trying to portray in order to prove every effort towards reformation and growth as deadly poison.

To identify and regard a certain condition as ideal and then critique the current scenario from that perspective does not mean that we want to make an instant jump from the current condition to the ideal condition. Obviously, no intelligent person could even imagine such a change because change will always be gradual. However, it can never be expected of any intelligent person either that he would agree to move in a direction which is diametrically opposed to the condition which he regards as the ideal. If he is a smart person, then he must at least have desire or be passionate about the pace of the circumstances which is moving in the direction of the destination which he terms as the objective even if it takes only few steps in the beginning. For instance, if I believe that the leadership, politics and lifestyle on the lines of the "Rightly Guided Caliphate" are ideal for the Muslims then this does not mean that any current leader of the Muslims should not be lesser than Umar ibn al-Khattab in any way and his comrades should be of the likeness of Ali ibn Abi Talib, Abu Ubaida ibn al-Jarrah and Abd-ur-Rahman bin al-Auf. But also, it shouldn't mean that although that should be my final destination as it was of the Sahaba (Prophet's Companions) my guides and leaders who take me to my destination be not those who are neither acquainted with the way nor have any will to go in the direction; rather are moving in the exactly opposite direction.

Assume that I want to go 10,000 feet above the ground, I have to seek the means which would take me up even if it takes me not more than 10 feet above the ground initially. If I were not to find such a means then I would rather like to stay on the ground. However, if you were to see me climbing into the elevator and going down into the coal mine and want to go up in this way then would you have the

slightest doubt in regarding me a fool? In exactly the same way, you should not have any doubt in my foolishness that to revive the Islamic culture and reach the ideal of Umar's style of governance, you see me going after those people in whose practical lives, actions, thoughts, views, style of politics and leadership not even a speck of Islam could be seen, whose situation is that in every matter – from the smallest to the biggest – neither do they know the Quran's point of view nor do they feel the need to search it*. Those to whom the light of guidance is found only in western laws and constitutions, always turn to the west and after that if there remains anything worthwhile in their view then it is only the temporary political interests which they look at from a purely materialistic perspective.

That is the destination and this is the way! What intelligent person would accept that someone terming this thing to be the objective would even think of stepping on this path?

A person going backwards can get away with it under the pretext of being a fool but it is quite strange for a person to be scared of his own ideal, get angry even at its mentioning, raise slogans of 'good job' and 'well done' upon its destruction, run to scratch out the eyes of its supporter but then insist that this is his ideal. This is the discovery of quite an unusual kind of ideal with which we have been totally unfamiliar up until now. We have always known that the ideal is man's most favourite thing, that even the thought of it warms the heart, that failing to reach it makes him sad, that he gets embarrassed by going against it and that he cannot look into the eye out of shame when he is

* In this "world of wonders" one of the wonderful things that is said is also that although our leaders are not well acquainted with Quran nevertheless whatever they are doing is exactly according to the Quran. In other words, it means that Prophethood is a useless thing that even without the knowledge of the Quran man could follow the straight path which the Quran itself has shown him. What could be an example of "bigotry of ignorance" worse than this.

reprimanded for this misconduct of his. However, we have now been introduced to this new kind of ideal which although is an ideal weirdly tends to make people's faces red with anger whenever it is mentioned, sour their moods when they are encouraged to get it and pushes them to blatantly offer all kinds of interpretations instead of being ashamed when they are stopped from going against it. There is none more hated in their eyes than the one who backs it and none more loved who betrays it. How weird is this ideal and how bizarre are its fans!

The extraordinary thing is that Islam and Islamic culture are always invoked when it comes to opposing the Congress party and its nationalism and Muslims are given a call to assemble by turning these very things into battle cry. However, where these protectors of Islam and Islamic culture do get assembled there the laws of Islam get openly broken, that very culture is slaughtered and it feels that the only reason they are on a war path is because they want to slaughter the Islamic culture in a 'halal' way by their own hands instead of seeing it get killed at one stroke at the hands of the others.

Just like a Shrimatiji or a Madam, there a "Muslim" woman too seems to be the "life of the party" with the full display of all her allurements as was the case in the time of Jahiliyyah (Pre-Islamic Dark Age). There we find rallies and public gatherings in full swing even at the time of prayer and if they are begrudgingly postponed then rarely anyone – from the leaders to the followers – could be seen getting up for prayer. No trace of Islamic culture could be found in the attire, meetings, conventions and parties there. And an ordinary Muslim feels like a stranger in the company of these supporters of Islam and the protectors of the Islamic culture just as much as he would feel in the company of the Hindus or the Zoroastrians. There, you could listen to the speeches and discussions for hours but not a single word of Quran or hadith would be mentioned even by mistake, Allah and His Messenger would not be referred to in finding the solution to any problem and as a

matter of fact if the perspective of the Quran and the Hadith is provided to them in a clear manner even then they would take a course of action completely opposite to that without any hesitation. You will never hear in their meetings and committees Muslims being mentioned as people who have a common goal, who are commissioned to discharge a moral duty and who have been given a divine mission. Instead the entire discussion there revolves around how to save this group of people called Muslims which is found here from worldly harms and disadvantages and how to secure worldly benefits and advantages for it. And then what about the state of affairs of the chiefs of this tribe? When you visit the homes of most of them, you will not find anyone capable of showing you the direction of the Qibla at the time of prayer and providing you a prayer-carpet in their mansions filled with all kinds of luxuries. If you were to make them sit for a test on the basic and elementary issues of Islam, hardly any one of them would be able to score more than an F, except if Allah Wills otherwise.

Is this the culture they claim to save from the Congress party and its nationalism? Are these the ways and methods to preserve and revive it? And is this how and is it under the leadership of such people that we can arrive at the rule of God which is termed as the ultimate goal?! This question is so dangerous that even asking it is like inviting trouble? The moment Islam and Islamic culture are mentioned there would be an outcry as to what kind of an untimely sloganeering is this? What kind of an occasion called for it? Don't you see we are still gathering for the protection of culture? Is the culture protected even while gathering?

It is because of this hypocrisy and deceit that others get a chance to say that the real question is merely about politics and economics, religion and culture are being used as excuses to stir up the sentiments of common Muslims. Obviously, by looking at all these shenanigans, who would think for a moment that you are really sincere in protecting

the honour of your religion and culture. If you say that you have a headache but keep on pressing your stomach then the one who is looking will think that you have stomach-ache rather than headache. It is this silliness which takes the winds out of a nation's sails and its awe from the hearts and minds of other nations.

By watching the divisions, dispersions and disorganisation, Muslims did come to realise the importance of association, organisation and centralisation but unfortunately the lack of rationality put even this useful sentiment on the wrong course. Generally, people are now misconstruing association, organisation and centralisation to be a mercy in and of itself. Hence, they decided to gather around any central point they could find and move together, God willingly they may reach some or the other destination. As "art for the sake of art" trended some time ago, in the same way "association for the sake of association", "organisation for the sake of organisation" and "centralisation for the sake of centralisation" are trending now. When the truth is the usefulness of all these things is dependent on the spirit of the association, the principles of the organisation and the nature of the centrality. Assembling around a wrong central point for no reason or for a wrong reason is harmful instead of being useful.

Muslims have to make a decision after a long and careful deliberation as to what their goal is and for what purpose they want to assemble and organise themselves?

If you truly want the organisation of a Muslim party which could protect Islam and its culture and finally reach the stage of an Islamic government then you must know that the organisation which is shaping up right now is totally wrong. Those who are seen at the forefront of this current organisation will have their true places at the very back in the Islamic party, in fact even there, some of them could get a place only as a concession. Making such kind of people leaders is just like putting the engine at the back of the train. On whichever incline you want

to move, this so-called engine could never take you in that direction even for an inch. However, the train would roll down the slope and you people would be under the impression that “masha Allah, our engine is so good that the train is flying”! The sooner you understand the truth the better because with every passing moment, you are going down than up. How could those who don't even know your culture protect it? How could they be expected to revive and develop a culture against which they are in open rebellion? They do shout ‘culture’ ‘culture’ at the top of their voices but if they were really so passionate about culture then certainly their lives, mindset and way of thinking would have been changed by now. Their lives are bereft of any such signs and it is a clear proof of the fact that the true Islamic passion has not ignited in this group. And if the Islamic objective is not before your eyes but rather in a simple sense you want the preservation of your individuality only as a nation and by creating the spirit of nationalism in yourselves your ultimate aim is to compete with other nations then without a doubt you don't need to search for any Islamic attributes in your leaders and I do not need to have any argument with you. Our paths are different. However, I will repeat the same thing which I said earlier that you have no right to use the name of Islam for this nationalistic movement of yours for Islam is the enemy of all kinds of nationalism be it Indian nationalism or the so-called “Muslim nationalism.”

Some people argue in favour of such an unIslamic gathering and centrality from the Quran and hadith as if this is the “party” which was mandated to be formed and hell was promised for staying away from it or severing ties with it. But I am baffled: should it be considered a miracle of being ignorant or showing boldness against God and His Messenger? The Quran doesn't even allow standing in a mosque not founded on God-consciousness. And here, those who even mention God-consciousness are considered crazy. The Quran commands to hold fast to “God's rope” and here it is being said that holding on to any rope with the unanimity of the people is the way to salvation regardless

of it being God's rope or not. The Quran clearly says:

إِنَّمَا وَلِيُّكُمُ اللَّهُ وَرَسُولُهُ وَالَّذِينَ آمَنُوا الَّذِينَ يُقِيمُونَ الصَّلَاةَ
وَيُؤْتُونَ الزَّكَاةَ وَهُمْ ذُرِّيَّةٌ

"Only Allah, His Messenger and those who believe and establish prayer and pay Zakat and bow (before Allah) are your allies."

(Al-Maidah 5:55)

Rather, it has also gone as far as:

فَإِنْ تَابُوا وَأَقَامُوا الصَّلَاةَ وَآتَوُا الزَّكَاةَ فَإِخْوَانُكُمْ فِي الدِّينِ

"But if they repent and establish prayer and give Zakat then they are your brothers in faith." (Al-Tawbah 9:11)

But here, the prerequisite of prayer and zakat are thought to be meaningless. Never mind brotherhood and sainthood, these things are not required even for leadership, in fact just mention these God-established prerequisites and you can see the scowl on their faces.

The truth is that the injunctions relating to the formation of a party and obedience to the leader and مَنْ شَذَّ فِي النَّارِ [whoever splits away from the party, does so in the fire] and other such warnings issued in the hadith against those severing their ties with the party and the leader have nothing to do with those parties and leaders which came into existence out of nationalistic principles and for worldly objectives. The formation of the party mentioned in the hadith actually means that party which serves the mission of Islam purely for Allah's sake with no worldly motives. The consequence of dissociating oneself from such a party is certainly and should be Hell-fire. However, using these instructions as arguments for forming political blocks with worldly motives and for loyalty to political parties is slander against the Prophet. If a nation wants to work against another for political and economic reasons then it ought to form a party or a block as per the common natural laws and try to strengthen it but how can it have

the right to bring God into the middle? Why would God have the need to take sides in a purely carnal conflict between two nations that He would punish those who dissociate themselves from one party with Hell-fire and just to strengthen the other party bring forth hell before every person who has dissociated or stays dissociated from it?

Some people suffer from the delusion that by السواد الاعظم "the biggest majority" is meant the majority of the Muslim population and the Prophet (peace be upon him) urged to side with السواد الاعظم and therefore, staying with the political party backed or followed by the majority of the Muslims becomes essential. But this is a completely wrong interpretation of the prophetic instruction. The "largest party" mentioned in the prophetic instruction actually refers to that majority of the Muslims who have Islamic consciousness, know the difference between truth and falsehood and who are aware of the spirit and basic principles of Islam at least to an extent where they can differentiate between Islam and non-Islam. The majority of such Muslims can never agree over falsehood and if it suffers from any misunderstanding then it cannot remain in that state for long. On this basis, the Prophet (peace be upon him) emphasised to stay with the largest party. The rowdiness of those who are bereft of these essential attributes and who cannot judge the good and the bad even at an elementary level can never be termed "the largest party." Neither their party is a "party" as per the Islamic understanding nor their leadership is "leadership" as per the Islamic terminology nor their leadership has any right in any way to demand "listening and obedience" of the Muslims. The dimwittedness of those who regard the reverence shown to the followers of Jahiliyyah as reverence that a reverence of such kind could prove useful from the Islamic point of view just by getting deceived by the word "Muslim" is worthy of mourning.



The Message of Islam And the Mission of Muslim

WHAT CONCLUSION DO intelligent people reach when they see a person suffering from seizures and is in a delirious state and deep pain all the time even in between breaks? Do they dismiss it as a superficial confusion or think that there is something physically and mentally wrong with him? Do they treat his seizures by tying up his hands and feet, his delirium by shutting his mouth and his fever by immersing him in ice? Or their entire effort is to understand the root cause which is produced inside the constitution of the biological workshop called his body and take remedial steps?

As far as individual circumstances are concerned, every intelligent person will go for the second option. But it is quite an amazing and pertinent question to think about that why does the same intelligence, which arrives at the right conclusion upon seeing this condition, die when it sees the whole humankind suffering from this condition?! The entire human world is facing a severe crisis today. It is going through such powerful seizures that the whole planet is shook. This was not the first bout. It is having such constant bouts since a while. And it doesn't stay calm even during the breaks between the seizures; always goes through some or the other pain. But despite the fact that the whole world is witnessing this condition for a long time, nobody bothers to think that there is a flaw in the foundation of human civilisation. All the "wise men" of the world are setting their eyes only on those external signs and symptoms which come to the surface due to

the internal flaw and everyone is putting their fingers on that tumour which appears to be the most prominent and are asking for it to be surgically removed believing that it will make everything better. Some say that the real devil is dictatorship, kill it. Some are of the opinion that the root cause of all the wrong in the world is imperialism, eliminate it. Some stress that it is Capitalism which has turned the whole into hell, finish it. Where have these fools lost their minds?! They are mistaking the branches for roots. They have no idea that the root is somewhere else and as long as it is firmly fixed in the soil, the branches will keep on coming no matter how much time is wasted on chopping them till the Day of Judgement.

Whatever evil is found in whichever place in the world, its root is the same – accepting the sovereignty of anyone but Allah's. This is the mother of all evils. This is the real seed of evil from which that evil tree grows whose branches spread far and wide giving poisonous fruits of problems to humanity. No matter how many branches you chop off you will not achieve anything as long as the root remains; problems from one side get stopped but arise from the other.

What would be achieved if dictatorship or absolutely monarchy is abolished? Is it not that one person or family is removed from the pedestal of God only to be replaced by parliament? But do the problems of mankind really get solved in this way? Are those areas free from injustice, corruption and transgression where parliament is God?

What would be achieved if imperialism is finished off? Would it not be that the lordship of one nation over the other comes to an end? But would this really be the beginning of peace and prosperity? Would man get any peace where a nation has become a God unto itself?

What would be achieved when Capitalism is eradicated? Would it not be that the working class will be liberated from the overlordship of the rich only to become slaves of the gods created by themselves? But would man really gain the blessings of freedom, justice and peace?

Does man have these blessings where the gods created by the workers are ruling?

At the most, the ideal which these people who have turned their faces away from God's sovereignty can present to the world is no more than total democracy in the world i.e. people becoming sovereigns for their own welfare regardless of whether or not such a situation can actually emerge in the world'. The point to be noted here is that if such a situation were to arise then in this fake "heaven" could man liberate himself from the demon of his own self i.e. from bondage to this ignorant and foolish "god", a god who has no knowledge, wisdom, justice and integrity but only desires and blind and despotic desires at that.

In short, the summary of all the solutions that are being contemplated for human problems in different parts of the world is that divinity or sovereignty be taken away from some humans and given to some other humans. However, this is not solving but aggravating the problem. It only means that the flood of problems which used to come from one direction will now be coming from another direction. If this can be called solution then it is just like replacing tuberculosis with cancer. If the goal was to treat tuberculosis then certainly you have succeeded, however if it was to save life then you have not earned any success by replacing one harbinger of death with another.

Whether one man becomes the Lord over another man or accepts somebody else's overlordship or becomes his own lord, at any rate the real cause of loss and destruction remains as it is because the one who is not a king in reality were to make himself a king, the one who is a slave were to place himself on the pedestal of Godhead and the one who is responsible and accountable to the people were to act as an irresponsible and a sovereign then this claim and the fact of accepting this claim would not be anything but a misunderstanding. Whatever

* Experience bears witness that true democracy has never been established in the world ever and logical arguments prove that this is practically impossible.

the truth is it will stay the same. The one who is really God will stay God and the one who is a slave will stay slave. However, when the slave erects the whole edifice of his life on this basic and huge mistake that he is the sovereign or some other slave is his sovereign and lives his life thinking that there is no one above him to whom he is answerable and whose pleasure he is in need of in do's and don'ts then certainly the entire edifice of his life from head to toe will be rendered totally wrong and searching righteousness and soundness in it would be nothing but foolishness.

How does a man's intellect accept that creation is by someone and rule is of someone else's altogether? That the Life-Giver and Nourisher is someone and authority is of somebody else's? That the kingdom is of someone and king is someone else?

Logic and nature demand that the one who created man, who created and made the planet his home, who nourishes him through air, water, light, temperature and other such things created by Him, whose power encompasses man and this entire world in which he lives and from whose grip man cannot escape in any case alone be the Lord, Master, God, King and Sovereign of the world. Who else has the right to rule the world created by Him but He? How can a slave have the right to say that he is the Master of other slaves like him? Except for the Creator and the Cherisher, who else has the legitimate claim to the ownership of His creation and slaves? Who else has such power, knowledge and capacity to rule this kingdom? If man does not accept the sovereignty of the true Sultan of this kingdom but rather accepts the sovereignty of someone else or claims his own sovereignty then it is against clear and obvious fact, fundamentally wrong and a massive lie. The greatest white lie of all time; a lie which is denounced by everything in the heavens and the earth all the time. The truth of the matter doesn't change a bit with such a wrong acceptance and obedience. The one who is the Master, the King and the Sovereign will stay as such no matter

if the entire life of a person becomes totally wrong from head to toe who accepts the sovereignty of someone else or himself claims to be the sovereign. Truth is not in need of anybody's approval to be truth. Nay, it is in fact the people who are in need of it so that they may realign their deeds and endeavours as per the truth after getting to know it. If people do not realise the truth and mistake a wrong thing to be truth then it is actually their loss. Their misunderstanding does not alter the truth in any way.

Obviously, the thing whose foundation itself is wrong from the beginning cannot be corrected with these minor alterations and partial reforms. The truth doesn't change when one lie is replaced with another. Such kind of a change can provide false comfort but the loss which occurred in the previous form as a result of building life on untruth will be there as it is but only in the new form.

There is no way to prevent this loss from occurring and to lead mankind to true success and happiness other than totally denying the sovereignty of anyone or anything but Allah and accepting the sovereignty of the one who is in reality the Owner of all sovereignty, totally rejecting all those systems of governance which are based on the ideology of human sovereignty and accepting only that system in which sovereignty lies with the one who is the actual sovereign, totally denying all those systems the right to governance in which man himself is the sovereign or claims to be the dictator of do's and don'ts and accepting only that government to be legitimate in which man accepts his status as being the vicegerent of the true and real sovereign. Unless and until this fundamental reform is not introduced, man's sovereignty in any shape or form is not uprooted and the unrealistic concept of human sovereignty is not replaced by the realistic concept of the Divine Caliphate, the damaged machine called human civilisation cannot be repaired whether communism replaces Capitalism or democracy takes dictatorship's place or nation-states are established

instead of imperialism. Only the ideology of the Caliphate can give real peace to man. It is known throughout Caliphate that oppression can be brought to an end and justice served. And it is by adopting Caliphate alone that man could find the direction for the proper utilisation of his energies and efforts. Nobody but the Lord of the worlds and the Knower of the open and the hidden has the ability to suggest such principles and boundaries for any human civilisation, principles which are frank, impartial, free from prejudice and selfishness, firmly established on justice, equally considerate to the interests of all the human beings and which is based not on conjecture but the certain knowledge of the truths of nature. Man can truly benefit from the blessings of these principles only when he abdicates his claim to being the lawmaker and dictator, believes in the law given by God and implements this code in the world with the realisation of accountability in the Afterlife.

Islam has come to introduce this fundamental reform in human life. It is not friends with one nation and foes with the other that it aims to elevate one and bring down the other. Rather, it seeks success and happiness for the whole humankind for which it presents a universal principle and code. It doesn't view any particular country or human group from a narrow angle but rather looks at the entire planet with all its inhabitants from a broad angle and by looking beyond small and temporary events and problems it focuses on those fundamental and essential issues whose resolution would automatically resolve all the secondary and subsidiary problems of all the places, situations and time periods. It doesn't argue with the branches of oppression and secondary shapes and forms of corruption that it expands its energy on cutting a branch at one place and fight with another branch at yet another place. Rather, it directly attacks the source of oppression and corruption so that the production of these branches comes to an end altogether and the daily struggles of cutting them do not remain at all.

In the eyes of Islam these small and secondary problems in

which the parties and the nations of the world are getting embroiled like Hitler's Nazi oppression in Europe, Italy's death and destruction in Ethiopia, Japan's terrorism in China or Britain's and France's imperialism in Asia and Africa have no importance at all. In its view only one question is important and it asks the whole world:

ءَأَرْبَابٌ مُتَفَرِّقُونَ خَيْرٌ أَمِ اللَّهُ الْوَاحِدُ الْقَهَّارُ

"Is it better that there be diverse lords or just Allah, the One, the Irresistible?"
(Yusuf 12:39)

Islam regards those who think that the first scenario is right as one group regardless of the divisions they have. In Islam's view their fights against one another is merely one corruption's fight against the other. None of their fights is against corruption itself but a branch of corruption and it is because it wants the flag bearers of one form of corruption to surrender so that another form of corruption could replace it whose flag is raised by a different group. Obviously, the group which is the enemy of corruption itself in all its shapes and forms cannot cooperate with any of these groups. For Islam, there is no question of preferring the devotees of one false lord over the worshippers of another. It is at war with all of them at the same time. It will spend all of its energy on attaining only one objective and that is to pull man away from bondage to diverse false lords and gods and make him accept the sovereignty of Allah, the One, the Irresistible who in reality is

رَبِّ النَّاسِ ۝ مَلِكِ النَّاسِ ۝ إِلَهِ النَّاسِ ۝

The Lord of mankind, the King of mankind, the true God of mankind.

(An-Nas 114:1-3)

If the word "Muslim" is meaningless now and is being used as a designation of a group of people then Muslims should have full freedom to choose whatever purpose they want for themselves and

live accordingly. However, if this word is used for those people who accepted Islam as a way of life then certainly Muslims cannot have any ideology, purpose and lifestyle but Islamic. Current conditions and demands of the time are no excuses for adopting unIslamic ideology and policy. Wherever and in whatever surroundings Muslims live in, they will inevitably face temporary incidents, regional circumstances and local matters. Then of what use is that Islam which is followed only in specific circumstances and then forsaken when the circumstances change only to be replaced by another ideology as per convenience? Actually, sticking to the course of action as per Islam's basic ideology and fundamental objectives in all of the diverse circumstances is being a Muslim otherwise if a Muslim were to view every event and circumstance from a separate angle and in accordance with the changing context device a new policy every time, a policy which has nothing to do with the ideology and objective of Islam then there is absolutely no difference between being such a Muslim and a non-Muslim. Following an ideology means that in whatever condition you are, your point of view and conduct should be according to that ideology of which you are a follower. A Muslim can be a true Muslim only when he follows the Islamic viewpoint and methodology in all temporary events and minute details of life. Any Muslim who abandons the Islamic aspect in any situation and adopts an unIslamic aspect and makes the excuse that he should be allowed to follow the unIslamic way in this situation and when the situation becomes favourable he shall return to the Islamic way is actually implying that he himself doesn't regard Islam to be a comprehensive system of life which encompasses every matter and vicissitudes of life or his mind has not been totally shaped by Islam because of which he doesn't have the ability to apply the general precepts to the particular events and understand what his policy as a Muslim ought to be in varied conditions and circumstances?

As a true Muslim when I take a look at the world, I do not find

any reason to be happy that Turks are ruling Turkey, Iranians are governing Iran and Afghans are running Afghanistan. By virtue of being a Muslim, I do not subscribe to the ideology of *حكم الناس على الناس للناس* i.e. 'government of the people, by the people and for the people', that I should be happy about. On the contrary, I believe in the ideology of *حكم الله على الناس بالحق* i.e. 'rulership of God on man with justice'. From this viewpoint, as much as the British ruling Britain and the French ruling France is wrong, so is the Turks ruling Turkey and the inhabitants of all other countries ruling their respective countries is wrong. Rather it is even worse that's because it is much more unfortunate for those nations which call themselves Muslim to accept the sovereignty of people instead of God. If non-Muslims come under the category of *ضالين* then they come under the definition of *مغضوب عليهم*. As a Muslim, I do not have any interest in Muslims forming their own government in India where they have a huge population. To me, the foremost question is: in this "Pakistan" of yours, will the system of governance be based on sovereignty of God or the people as per the western ideology of democracy? If it is the first case then it will definitely be "Pakistan" (holy land) otherwise in the second case it will be as "unholy" as the part of your country ruled by the non-Muslims according to your scheme. Rather, it will be more unholy, damned and hated in the sight of God because here those who call themselves Muslims will govern the country as governed by the non-Muslims. If I am happy to see a Ram Das sitting on the pedestal of divinity here instead of an Abdullah then it would not be Islam but pure nationalism and this "Muslim nationalism" is as accursed in the Shariah of God as "Indian nationalism."

As a Muslim, this question too doesn't have any importance to me whether India remains a single country or gets divided into ten countries. The whole earth is one country. Human beings have divided it into thousands of pieces. If this division of the earth has

* Astray (Al-Fatihah 1:7).

† Who did not incur your wrath (Al-Fatihah 1: 7).

been legitimate up until now then what difference would it make if it is divided even more? What big issue is it that Muslims should waste their time thinking about it?! A Muslim is only interested in whether man bows to the rule of God or the people? If he bows to God then expand India as far as possible, even bring down the barrier of the Himalayas and ignore the ocean so that Asia, Africa, Europe and America can all be part of India. But if he bows to the rule of the people then India and the worshipper of its soil can go to hell, why should I be interested whether it remains one country or gets partitioned into thousand countries. Let him cry over the breaking of this idol who worshipped it as a deity. If I were to get even a square mile of land where there is nobody's sovereignty but God's then this piece of soil is more precious to me than the whole of India.

As a Muslim, this too has no value to me that India be liberated from British imperialism. Freedom from British rule is synonymous with لا إله (i.e. there is no God). The decision doesn't rest on this denial alone but rather on what affirmation comes after this. If the whole fight for freedom is only for this – and who amongst the freedom fighters could dare to lie – that by removing the deity of imperialism, the deity of democracy be put in the temple of government then to a Muslim this doesn't make any difference whatsoever. The idol of al-Laat is removed only to be replaced by al-Manat. One fake deity took over the place left vacant by another deity. The bondage to falsehood remained as it is. What Muslim could call it freedom?

إِنَّ اللَّهَ لَا يَمْحُو السَّيِّئَ بِالسَّيِّئِ وَلَكِنْ يَمْحُو السَّيِّئَ بِالْحَسَنِ إِنَّ الْخَبِيثَ لَا يَمْحُو الْخَبِيثَ

That is, Allah doesn't remove vice with vice but with virtue and impurity cannot remove another impurity.

If the ideologies, objectives and achievements of all the Muslim parties currently working in India in the name of Islam are actually judged on the Islamic standards then all of them would turn out to be rotten, whether they be western educated and trained political leaders

or the clerics and the muftis. Both categories of leaders are equal losers from the perspective of their ideologies and policies. Both are wandering in the dark, away from the true path. Both are shooting their arrows without actually hitting the target. One group is obsessed with the Hindus and it deems freedom from the clutches of Hindu imperialism to be salvation. The other group is haunted by the British and it considers freedom from British imperialism to be salvation. Neither one of them has the sight of a Muslim otherwise they would have seen that the real devil is neither this nor that but the sovereignty of anyone but Allah. There is no salvation without any freedom from this. If there is any true fight then it is the fight to end this. Whatever arrows you want to shoot, this should be the target. Whatever energy you want to spend, spend it on obliterating this. Apart from this, whatever efforts you apply to anything would turn into waste just as the efforts of those about whom the Quran makes the judgement:

قُلْ هَلْ نُنَبِّئُكُمْ بِالْأَخْسَرِينَ أَعْمَالًا ۝ الَّذِينَ ضَلَّ سَعْيُهُمْ فِي
الْحَيَاةِ الدُّنْيَا وَهُمْ يَحْسَبُونَ أَنَّهُمْ يُحْسِنُونَ صُنْعًا ۝ أُولَٰئِكَ
الَّذِينَ كَفَرُوا بِآيَاتِ رَبِّهِمْ وَلِقَائِهِ فَحَبِطَتْ أَعْمَالُهُمْ فَلَا نُقِيمُ لَهُمْ
يَوْمَ الْقِيَامَةِ وِزْرًا ۝

Say, (O Muhammad): "Shall We tell you who will be the greatest losers in respect of their works? It will be those whose effort went astray in the life of the world and who believe nevertheless that they are doing good. Those are the ones who refused to believe in the revelations of their Lord and that they are bound to meet Him. Hence, all their deeds have come to naught, and We shall assign no weight to them on the Day of Resurrection.

(Al-Kahfi:103-105)

Western-styled leaders aren't that much of a surprise as those poor souls are not aware of the Quran but quite surprising are those religious scholars whose vocation is to teach what Allah and His Messenger have said. It is quite hard to understand as to what had happened to them! With what angle do they approach the

Quran that after having read a thousand times they are not guided to this categorical and permanent policy which has essentially been established for a Muslim. Those issues and problems which they regard as important and preeminent, we do not find them to be given even minor and incidental importance in the Quran. Those issues for which they eagerly held All India Azad Muslim Conference in Delhi and gave passionate speeches, we do not find them discussed in the Quran even allusively. On the contrary, we find in the Quran that Prophet after Prophet comes and gives the same message to his people

يَقُومُوا عِبَادُوا اللَّهَ مَا لَكُمْ مِنَ الْغَيْرَةِ

O my people! Worship Allah, you have no God other than Him.

(Al-A'rāf: 59)

Be it Babylonia, Sodom, Midyan, the land of Hijr, the Nile valley or be it the 40th century B.C. or 20th or 10th or be it a slave nation, free nation, destitute nation or culturally and politically superior nation... to every nation, in every period of time and at everywhere, the leaders sent by God have presented the same message to human beings and that was "worship Allah, you have no god other than Him." Prophet Abraham said to his people clearly that there can be no cooperation between him and the people until they accept this fundamental principle that

كَفَرْنَا بِكُمْ وَبَدَا بَيْنَنَا وَبَيْنَكُمُ الْعَدَاوَةُ وَالْبَغْضَاءُ أَبَدًا حَتَّى تُؤْمِنُوا بِاللَّهِ وَحَدَّثَا

We renounce you and there has come to be enmity and hatred between us and you until you believe in Allah, the One true God.

(Al-Mumtahinah: 60:4)

Before making the demand of

فَأَرْسِلْ مَعِيَ بَنِي إِسْرَءِيلَ

So let the children of Israel go with me

(Al-A'rāf: 105)

Musa declared to the Pharaoh that

إِنِّي رَسُولٌ مِّن رَّبِّ الْعَالَمِينَ ۝

I am a Messenger from the Lord of the Universe. (Al-A'raf 7:104)

and gave him the message of

هَلْ لَّكَ إِلَىٰ أَن تَزَكَّىٰ ۖ وَأَهْدِيكَ إِلَىٰ رَبِّكَ فَتَعْبُدْهُ ۖ

And say to him: Are you willing to be purified, that may direct you to your lord and then you hold Him in awe? (Al-Naziat 79: 18-19)

and warned him that he is not the Lord rather the Lord is He who created everything and then guided it

رَبُّنَا الَّذِي أَعْطَىٰ كُلَّ شَيْءٍ خَلْقَهُ ثُمَّ هَدَىٰ ۝

He said: our lord is He who gave everything its form and then guided it.

(Ta'ha 20:50)

Prophet Jesus, whose nation was enslaved by the Romans, did not call the Israelites and other people of the surrounding area to fight against Roman imperialism for freedom rather he called them to

إِنَّ اللَّهَ رَبِّي وَرَبُّكُمْ فَأَعْبُدُوا هَذَا صِرَاطٌ مُسْتَقِيمٌ ۝

Surely Allah is my Lord and your Lord, So Serve Him, alone This is the Straight way. (Al-Imran 3:51)

Obviously, the events mentioned in the Quran are not from any other world but ours in which we live and are related to human beings like us. It cannot be said that those countries and nations in which the prophets and messengers were sent did not have any political, economic or cultural problem in need of solution. So, when the fact is that when every leader of the Islamic Movement ignored all the temporary and local problems in every country and period of time and put that one issue at the forefront and applied all his efforts to it then the only conclusion that can be derived from it is that to them this was

the mother of all problems and deemed the solution to all the problems dependent on the solution to this one singular problem.

Now, either say it that all those leaders of the Islamic Movement who were sent by God were ignorant of practical politics, neither did they know what should be dealt with first and what should be dealt with last nor were they aware of how to fight for freedom and what measures must be taken for the resolution of the problems faced by the country or then admit that no matter how much expertise those people, who are the representatives of Islam and leaders and guides of Muslims, have in the details of the Shariah, they at any rate do not understand the nature of the Islamic Movement and do not know the methodology of running and advancing this movement.

All Muslims must know that by virtue of being a Muslim party, our relationship is with that movement whose leaders were the prophets of God (peace be on them all). Every movement has a certain way of thinking and work-style. We find the Islamic way of thinking and work-style in the conduct of the prophets. Regardless of the country and period of time we live in and regardless of the kind of problems and issues of the life all around us, our purpose and mission are those which were of the prophets and the way to reach that destination is the one treaded by the prophets in every age.

أُولَئِكَ الَّذِينَ هَدَى اللَّهُ فَبِهِدْهُمْ أَقْبَدَ

*(O Muhammad), those are the ones Allah guided to the Right way Follow,
then, their way...*

(Al-An'am 6:90)

We need to view all the matters of life as they viewed. Our standard of values should be that which was theirs and our social policy should be on those lines which were set by them. If we abandon this way of life and adopt the ideology and methodology of another way of life then we will go astray. This is beneath us to look at world affairs from such a narrow perspective as a nationalist or a democrat

or a communist looks. Things which are the ultimate and of the highest importance in their view are so low in our view that they are not worthy of even the slightest of our attention. If we too were to adopt their ways, use the same language as theirs and emphasise on the same objectives with which they are so infatuated then we would be destroying our own reputation. If the tiger were to start speaking the language of the sheep and run after grass like goats then it means that he himself has abdicated as the king of the jungle. Now how can he expect that the inhabitants of the jungle would accept that position which is befitting of a tiger? These demands for a nation-state based on numbers, these lamentations of majority and minority, the screaming and yelling for reservations and rights, these strategies for the preservation of national interests under the benevolence of the British empire and the rulers of princely states and then these slogans for independence and dancing to Pundit Nehru's tunes of opposition to imperialism are all the bleats of sheep. By these bleats, we take a wrong stance and present it in such a wrong way that the world is forced to deem us sheep. God gave us a responsibility much higher than this. Our job is to eliminate the sovereignty of anyone or anything who is not Allah and do not allow anyone to rule over God's slaves but God. This is the tiger's job and no external conditions are needed to do this job but for the tiger's heart. It is not a tiger which bleats in a cage like a sheep or forgets that it is a tiger by looking at their large numbers or their tyranny and high-handedness.



The Only Course of Action For Muslims

I HAVE MENTIONED this before that Islam has come with a message to the whole human world of fundamental reform and a revolutionary programme of practical reform. Its message is that all the human beings accept the sovereignty of Allah, the one true God who has no partners until all the other rule but for His becomes null and void. And its programme is that those of the human beings who accept this message form a party and try their utmost to implement this fundamental reform until the sovereignty of individuals, families, classes, nations and races and the self-government of the majority is totally abolished and only God's law is practically enforced in His kingdom on His subjects. This was the message and the programme brought by the Prophet since the beginning. It was this one purpose on which they focused all their efforts. And Muslims too, who are the heirs to the prophets, neither have any purpose nor course of action other than this. The objection I have against different political parties of the Muslims is despite calling themselves to be the followers of the prophets, they forsook this mission and course of action and adopted objectives and ways which Islam has nothing to do with.

Leaving aside these people who have no knowledge of Islam, I haven't come across any Muslim, regardless of what party he belongs to, who has not essentially accepted this objection after hearing it. All believe that undoubtedly this is the real job of a Muslim and to this destination the prophets have guided. However, two different voices

come from two different directions as an answer:

“The Pro-Independence religious scholars” and like-minded Muslims talk about the problems preventing them from coming to this path that had there been only Muslims in India or been in a big majority the likes of Egypt, Iran, Iraq etc. then it would had been easy for us to struggle for the establishment of the rule of God in the country and there would indeed had been a possibility of it in such a scenario. However, the problem is that we are in a minority here. The majority is non-Muslim, plugs its ears whenever it hears about the rule of God and its sight can only reach up to the goal of forming a joint federal government. There is the British government over us which suppresses both the Muslims and the non-Muslims. A large part of the Muslim population itself is in a state of moral and religious decline. Therefore, the only thing that can be done now is to accept the goal of forming a joint federal government and together with the non-Muslims liberate ourselves from the British rule. After this phase, we shall assemble all our forces once again in independent India and start working to achieve our own objective. Except for this, there is no other way right now which could work.

On the other hand, Muslim League and the like-minded people express their problems for coming to this path in a different way. They say that first of all we are in a minority here, then we are weak educationally and economically and moreover a very narrow-minded majority has gained control over the sources of political and economic power in this country, a majority which not only practically shuts every door of getting education and employment for ourselves by deeming us to be a separate nation but also for political interests essentially denies our separate and independent national existence and wants us to join the “Indian nation” and form a democratic government in which the way to come to power is decided merely by the number of votes. If it achieves its goal then it would mean the loss of our national identity itself; then how can we even dream of establishing the rule of God.

Therefore, currently, there is no other workable way but to organise ourselves just like the rest of the nations of the world and fight the political fight just as they do and establish our rule in Muslim-majority areas in accordance with the democratic constitution drafter under the British concept of democracy. Later on, when we get the authority, we shall reform the educational, cultural and moral condition of the Muslims and gradually turn the rule of people into the rule of God. And if God wills then we shall continue to fight for the retrieval of the rest of India too.

On the face of it, the arguments of both the parties feel quite compelling and it is because of this reason that the Muslims of India are divided into these two camps. However, the truth is that there is absolutely no weight in the problems mentioned by these people. In fact, the kind of problems which they talk of in the path to the rule of God is a clear proof that they have not understood the nature and technique of the Islamic Movement. There is no need to go any deeper, if the history of this movement is in front of us then the mistakes of these excuses become conspicuous at the first glance itself.

In whichever part of the world a Prophet has come he has come alone. Let alone the question of majority and minority, there was no existence of any "Muslim nation." The Messenger rises up with an astonishing minority in a nation or the world with the claim that he has come to establish the kingdom of God on earth. A handful of individuals join him, a minority equal to a drop in an ocean, fights for the rule of God. Compared to the treatment meted out to them by the ocean of majority around them, the oppression and tyranny of the non-Muslim majority of India is nothing over which our "Muslim nationalists" keep on lamenting resulting in the drying up of their tears. Never mind jobs, businesses and district boards, in those times and countries, the minority was not given the right to even breathe. Regardless of the government being native or foreign, the way it used to tighten its grip of oppression on that minority and torture it

is incomparable with the treatment of the British rulers of India the tyranny of which our "Pro-Independent" brothers bemoan day and night. Then it wasn't necessary either that the Messenger and his companions would succeed in establishing the rule of God. They have been unsuccessful many times. They were even killed and the false claimants to lordship and sovereignty rooted this movement out in their frenzy. Nonetheless, those who believed in Allah and to whom this was the actual mission, worked for it till their last breath and none of them paid any attention to other ways in the face of temporary and local problems or the majority or the government of the time.

So, it is totally wrong to say that external factors and favourable circumstances are needed to launch and run this movement. The external factors and favourable circumstances these people are looking for were never available nor will be available ever. Actually, it is the internal of a Muslim rather than the external where faith is needed. A testimony from the heart is needed that this objective is true and a determination is needed that living and dying are dedicated to this mission. If this faith, testimony and determination are present then only one person is enough to announce to the world that he wants to establish the rule of God on earth. He absolutely does not need any organised minority or a sovereign majority for his backing. Nor does he have the need for his country to be liberated from foreign occupation. Never mind foreign nation, never mind one's own nation, those who accept the sovereignty of anyone but Allah are all the same to him; his fight with them and their fight with him is the same. The way Abraham's own people treated him was much worse than the way Romans treated Jesus.

This is something anybody who has read the Quran while understanding it can feel at a cursory glance. But if it is looked at a little deeper then it emerges that the kind of problems these people are finding to be blocking their way is actually the problems of a nation not a movement. Any nation striving for itself and its national interests will

undoubtedly face these kind of problems. For it, the questions like how much is its population in the country of its residence? Is it organised or not? What is its educational situation? What is its economic situation? How much debt does it have? Its future is dependent on the answers to these questions and it is according to these answers that it has to develop its policy. But an ideological movement should not be associated with the national interests of any particular nation but rather ought to have a message of welfare and reformation for human life. It doesn't bother with any of these questions. The nature of its problems is totally different. Its success and failure depend on whether or not its principles are logical in themselves? To what extent do they solve the problems of human life? To what extent do they appeal to the human nature in general? And how sincerely practising and determined are its preachers?

Whatever problems Muslims are facing, its actual cause is that their intelligentsia got two different positions mixed-up. Sometimes they talk about resolutions and objectives which are related to the Islamic Movement. And it feels from their talk that they are actually the followers and preachers of an ideological movement. However, sometimes they act and think like a nation. They get themselves entangled in issues that are only faced by nations and because of this peculiar nationalistic way of thinking find these problems to be obstacles in the path which are obstacles only in the path of national interests. They have still not understood the difference between these two positions. Nor did they decide what they actually are? That's why they couldn't make a policy yet which is free from inconsistency and confusion.

It is as clear as the day that nationalism and national interests are not worthy of propagating. For instance, none can even conceive that others can be invited to Germanism, Italianism, Britishism or Hindutva. These are not principles which can be presented to every human being. These are rigid spheres made up of race, history and civilisation. Only

those people can be interested in the objectives and gains of these spheres who were born in these spheres. People of other spheres will not have any reason to be interested in them. If a German who wants to do something based on his Germanness inevitably can expect sympathy and help from Germans alone. What does a British person have anything to do with German way of life or support someone in making it supreme?! Only Germans would be passionate about making Germanism supreme and it is but natural that the British too would take up their shields against it and unite to make Britishism supreme. It is quite possible that the two parties could buy out some of the members of their opponents through illegal means and turn them into their agents. But it is not possible that a British person could believe in Germanism and become a staunch supporter of the Germans or a German adopt Britishism and become a supporter of the British. This is the reason that whenever there is an agreement between two nations, it is an agreement of selfishness and remains as long as selfishness demands and when there is conflict and opposition between them, they both have to rely on their national strength, organisation, economic resources, numbers, and tools of war. From this perspective, the nation which is weak gets crushed and the nation which is strong crushes it. Why were Poland, Denmark, Norway, Holland, Belgium and France conquered by Germany? Why did Finland and Romania have to yield before Russia and Germany? Because the conflict was between two nations. On both sides was nationalism and therefore whoever's nationalism had more numbers, tools, resources and organisation it crushed the weaker one. Based on pure humanity, not one party rose up with principles appealing to the opponent's people and it would have been possible that it could have won friends from the foes.

This is what the position of a nation is. Think, is this what the true position of Muslims is in the world or in India? Are we a group formed by race, history and civilisational legacy whose nationalism just like all the other nationalisms is unfit and unworthy of propagation? Is

the nature of our objectives just like national objectives and interests which are naturally impossible for other nations to believe in? Are our interests just like national interests the safeguarding of which is dependent on numbers, organisation and resources? Is the Islamic rule which we often talk about merely a nation-state which is founded on the majority? Because of our small numbers, does our position really change into a national minority for whom there remains no other option but to integrate with the majority or take steps for the protection and preservation of one's uniqueness? For us, is the meaning of freedom truly the same as other nations which is to liberate ourselves from foreign rule? And is the establishment of the rule of our own nation or countrymen important to our objectives as well?

If this is truly our position then without a doubt all that which many different Muslim parties are doing at the moment is right. The struggle for freedom by joining our non-Muslim neighbours is also right, fighting Hindu imperialism with the help of British government and princely states is also right, quarrelling over one's representation in the military, government jobs and legislative assemblies is also right, supporting Muslim states is also right, demanding partition of the country is also right, the militant organisation of the Khaksars is also right and Muslim nationalism based on which every advantage is firmly held on to regardless of truth and principles is also right. In short, all those things are right because this is what the constitution of nationalism is, this is how nations work and after all what measures a nation, which is not a champion of any principle but is rather interested only in its national welfare, could take other than the ones mentioned above? However, along with all these things if there is anything not right then it is our presumptuousness that even after assuming this position, we can establish rule of God on earth even though in this position this dream can never be fulfilled.

Actually, if there is anything that has the power to conquer

not just a country but the world then it is only the ideological party which addresses man in his capacity of a human being and presents to him the natural principles of his own success. In sharp contrast to nationalism, such a movement is a powerhouse of propagation. The siege of nationalism, the prejudices of racism, the strong borders of nation-states, nothing could stand in its way. It penetrates everywhere and every place. Its strength doesn't depend on the number of its followers or resources. A single person is enough to take it up. It advances by the dint of its own principles. It creates friends in its foes. People break away from every nation and come out to gather under its banner bringing their resources with them. Armies come to fight it but it not only fires rockets and missiles at them but also its teachings and principles. It finds ardent supporters amongst mortal enemies. It gets soldiers, generals, experts, wealthy people, industrialists and labour from them and all kinds of riches flow out of impoverishment. Nationalities cannot stand in the way of its flood. Huge mountains, that stand in its way, crumble like salt getting absorbed in this fast-moving water. That is why the question of majority and minority is meaningless. It is never in need of the support of any organised and resourceful nation. It did not rise to form a national government that nations should oppose it. It wants to establish the rule of such a principle which appeals to the nature of the people of all the nations. Prejudices of Jahiliyyah (ignorance) fight it for some time but when the paint covering the human nature starts to wear off then the situation would be that:

ہمہ آہوان صحرا سر خود نہادہ بر کف
بامید آں کہ روزے بشکار خواهی آمد

All the deer of the desert have their heads on the floor

Hoping you will hunt one day

Muslims should look at themselves in the mirror of the Quran and the Sunnah. Is the thing because of which they call themselves Muslims

not that exact kind of movement? Is it the case that by living among nations and getting their kind of education and training Muslims have forgotten their actual position and by calling themselves a nation for no reason have imposed all those limitations on their thinking which are specific to a nation with fewer means and resources?

If this is truly the case and the real position of Muslims is that of the followers and proponents of a universal ideological movement then those problems will be gone at the stroke of a pen on which the political and religious leaders of Muslims have been wasting their time. The entire situation totally changes. All the activities of Muslim League, Majlis-e-Ahrar-ul-Islam, the Khaksar movement, Jamiat-ul-Ulama and the All India Azad Muslim Conference will stand null and void. Neither are we a national minority nor does our worth depend on the percentile of the population. Neither do we have any national conflict with the Hindus nor is our fight against the British based on patriotism. Neither do we have any relationship with those so-called states in which Muslims are ruling as gods nor do we need minority reservations or demand a nation-state based on majority. The only goal before us is that the slaves of Allah should be subject to nobody's rule but Allah's. The sovereignty of people must end. The rule should be of that just law which Allah has sent down. We shall present this goal to everyone – the Indian states in a subsidiary alliance with the British Raj, Hindus, Sikhs, Christians, Zoroastrians and census-Muslims – whoever accepts it will be our friend and whoever rejects it we will fight them regardless of the disparity in our strengths.

In order to take up this position and launch this movement it is necessary that we forget about our personal and national interests, rise above all prejudices and take our eyes away from little things which are associated to our insignificant worldly advantages. If we have the prejudice of Indianness in us then naturally our message will fall on deaf ears of the British and every non-Indian. If we are under the

impression of being a so-called Muslim nation then there is no reason as to why the heart of a Hindu or a Sikh or a Christian will ever open for our message. If we back Hyderabad, Bhopal, Bahawalpur, Rampur and other such states merely because their elites are Muslim and Muslims could get some economic support from them then it could only be a fool who would believe that we believe in Islam's political ideology and truly want to establish the rule of God. If we quarrel over jobs in non-Muslim governments and representation of Muslims in unIslamic democratic institutions then there won't be any force in this voice of ours that we have risen to establish the rule of Islamic principles. If we demand for the partition of the country based on the percentage of population then non-Muslims would not find any difference whatsoever between themselves and us that they feel the necessity to change their position and say an emphatic yes to our rallying cry. If we participate in the formation of a joint national government then there would be such a clear contradiction in this act of ours and our message that let alone our truthfulness even our mental soundness would be in doubt. We have to leave all this in order to tread this path. Undoubtedly, we shall suffer many a great loss but without bearing such losses neither an Islamic Movement has ever been built nor could be built. Let us leave whatever leaves. In the words of Jesus (peace be upon him) - and if anyone wants to sue you and take your shirt, hand over your coat as well. Only then the rule of God will get established on earth.



The Straight Path of Islam And the Paths of Deviance From It

THOSE PEOPLE FROM among the Muslims who have their eyes set on the goal of creating Pakistan and those people who have pinned all their hopes on liberating India from the British rule and those who are in search of different paths between the two seem to have one thing in common: they all hesitate to advance towards Islam's real goal. They see a huge mountain of problems blocking their path and by looking at it from afar they either turn right or left in order to circumvent it. And I believe based on my insights that it is not possible to achieve the goal by circumventing it. It is only by following the straight path that this goal can be achieved and the problems that come across the way are not insurmountable provided efforts are made to understand and remove them correctly.

By analysing the compendious claim made by me above, I shall now expand and discuss it point by point in detail.

What is the real Islamic goal?

What is the straight path leading to it?

What are the difficulties that are seen treading in this path?

What sideways are taken by seeing these difficulties?

What is wrong with these different paths and why they cannot lead to the real destination?

What is the nature of these difficulties and how they can be removed?

These are the questions which I shall briefly discuss in this chapter.

Islamic Goal

The answer to the first question given in the Quran is as follows:

هُوَ الَّذِي أَرْسَلَ رَسُولَهُ بِالْهُدَىٰ وَدِينِ الْحَقِّ لِيُظْهِرَهُ عَلَى الدِّينِ
كُلِّهِ وَلَوْ كَرِهَ الْمُشْرِكُونَ

He it is Who has sent forth the Messenger with the Guidance and the True Religion that He may make it prevail over all religion, however those that associate aught with Allah in His Divinity might dislike this. (Al-Saff 61:9)

Al-Huda (Guidance) mentioned in this verse refers to the right way of living life in the world. God sent His Messenger with answers to the question of what should be the right attitude for human life towards individual behaviour, family system, social order, economic affairs, civil administration, political strategy, international relations, in short, all aspects of life.

The other thing brought by the Messenger is the true system of life/Deen. The meaning of the Arabic word "Deen" (دين) is obedience. Faith and religion for which the word "Deen" is used are not in reality its subject-matters. Rather the reason why they too are called "Deen" is because even in a religion, man obeys a particular system of thought and action. Actually, the word has approximately the same meaning as the word "state" in our current times. State is what the people accept and obey as a higher authority. This is the meaning of "Deen" as well. And the "True Deen" is man forsaking servitude and obedience to other men, his own ego and all the creatures and submit to and obey only Allah's authority. Hence, in actuality, Allah's Messenger comes with a system of "state" from his sender in which neither is there any room for man's sovereignty nor man's lordship over other men, rather sovereignty and overlordship belong to none but Allah.

The purpose of sending the Messenger is to make this system of obedience (Deen) and this law of life (al-Huda) prevail over the entire genus of Deen! What is meant by the entire genus of Deen? Be it individual or collective, in whichever forms man obeys someone, are all different species of the "genus Deen." Children obeying their parents, wife obeying her husband, servant obeying his master, a subordinate obeying his superior, public obeying its government, followers obeying their leaders and all these numerous forms obedience collectively form a system of obedience and the purpose of the Messenger sent by Allah is that this entire system of obedience with all its parts become subject to a bigger obedience and a bigger law. All forms of obedience should be subject to the obedience of Allah. They should be regulated by the law of one Allah only. And there should not be any obedience beyond the limits of this larger obedience and code of law.

This is the mission of the Messenger and he is appointed to fulfil this mission, no matter how much the pagans and polytheists may detest it. Who are those committing polytheism? All those who include obedience to others (independent of God) with obedience to Allah in their individual and social lives. As far as Allah's law of nature is concerned then every human being obeys it willingly or unwillingly because there is no other option but to obey it. However, as far as man's sphere of choice is concerned then some become total followers of anyone or anything but Allah, while some divide their lives into different parts and obey the moral law (Shariah) sent by God in one part and obey one's ego or others in other parts of their lives. This is what including obedience to others with obedience to Allah means. And those who are involved in these different forms of polytheism, find dedicating their 'servitude and obedience by choice' totally to Allah just like their natural obedience, unpalatable. Either out of foolishness or moral weakness, nonetheless, they insist on polytheism. But the Messenger of Allah has been given the duty to fulfil his mission despite the opposition of such people.

The Straight Path to the Islamic Goal

The straight path to the Islamic goal is that which was adopted by the Messenger of Allah: inviting people to “al-Huda” and the “true Deen.” Then, when people accept this invitation and make their servitude and obedience exclusively to Allah, stop associating obedience to others with obedience to Allah and make the law of God the law of their lives, they should be made into a strong party. Then this party should utilise all the material, moral and intellectual resources at its disposal for the greater Jihad of establishing the true system of life, until the power of obedience to everyone or everything but Allah is broken and the entire system of obedience is brought under al-Huda and the true Deen.

Every Part of This Straight Path is Worthy of Consideration

The first part is that people in general be invited to accept the sovereignty and ultimate authority of Allah and make the law sent by Him to be the law of their lives. This invitation should be common, continuous and free from any unrelated matter. Mutual conflicts of nations, races and countries, disputes over one’s own political and economic interests, preferring one ungodly system over another, supporting a corrupt and selfish system or trying to make a place for oneself in a corrupt system – all these things are not only incompatible with al-Huda and the true Deen but also clearly against and damaging to them. Therefore, if any person or group has to discharge the duty of inviting to the truth then he or it should distance oneself from all these conflicts and arguments and not attach any irrelevant and incompatible issue to his mission.

The second part is that this party be comprised of only those people who have accepted its message with full understanding and complete realisation of its content, actually dedicate their obedience and servitude exclusively to Allah, stop associating obedience to others with obedience to Allah and really make the law of God the law of their lives. As for the others who merely acknowledge this way

of thinking or life or sympathise with it, then they cannot become members of this party let alone leaders. There is no doubt that whoever becomes its sympathiser or external supporter in any capacity is much appreciated but the real difference and distinction between members and sympathisers must not be ignored in any circumstances.

The third part is that the ungodly system be directly attacked. All the efforts be aimed at only one thing: establishing the rule of God. And energies be not wasted on any objective other than this.

Problems

Currently, all the independent political parties of Muslims in India have nearly the same claim that their goal is the Islamic goal. However, they have all abandoned the straight path which I have just explained above. They neither give a general invitation to the pure and unadulterated "al-Huda" and "true Deen" nor do they form a party whose membership and leadership are limited to only those who have really made their obedience and servitude exclusively to Allah, leave all irrelevant goals and focus all their efforts on that one goal only which is mentioned in the Quran. All these parties have deviated from these three parts of the straight path.

In what forms this deviation has manifested itself in the doctrines of these different parties? I shall explain it in detail shortly but first I want to tell you about the cause of this deviation. The cause is that people face three major difficulties in directly advancing towards the real Islamic goal, difficulties for which they seem to find no solution:

The first problem they face is that they find the success of "al-Huda and the "true Deen" in current circumstances to be impossible. They say other movements give solutions to only political, economic and civilisational problems and those who find these solutions appealing join these movements without having to have their religions and nationalities changed. However, Islam not only gives solutions to worldly problems but also gives a code of beliefs, worship and laws and

it is absolutely crucial for the people joining this movement to change their religion and abandon nationalism. Or else how can it be hoped that Islam's general message could spread just like other movements?

The second problem they face in this path is that people are seriously prejudiced against Islam. They think that it is easy for other movements to spread because there are no prejudices against them but the spread of Islam is difficult because the moment its name is mentioned a storm of past and present prejudices rises up.

The third problem in their eyes is that a nation of millions of Muslims is found here which has "Muslim" as regards their nationhood but its moral stature is not that high that it could launch a struggle to achieve the Islamic goal. We cannot take this path with this nation but we do not want to leave this nation either. And then this question too worries us that if all the attention is paid to this only goal of establishing the rule of God by ignoring all other aims and objectives then what would happen to the national interest of "Muslims" in current political circumstances and upcoming constitutional changes?

The Path of Deviation

These are the three problems by seeing which people are trying to make a detour, either to the right or the left. From the perspective of details if the differences in the ideologies and methodologies of the people are ignored and only their beliefs and principles are taken into account then they get classified into three groups:

First group is the one which says that first of all we need to reconcile with the non-Muslim population of India and free this country from the British rule so that a federal democratic state is created. After this stage, we shall try to gradually turn this state into an Islamic state.

Second group is that which thinks that we need to stop the domination of the Hindu majority by taking advantage of the British rule and devise strategies by which two democratic states are created in this country instead of one. One state would be that in which the power

stays in the hands of the Muslims because of them being a majority and the other state would be that in which the power stays with the Hindus but also preserving the position of Muslims with as many constitutional rights and reservations as possible. After this stage, we shall gradually turn the Muslim majority state into an Islamic state and then try to change and reform the Hindu-majority state.

Third party is that which, for the purpose of making the creation of a general message and revolutionary party easy, wants to reform Islam so that it becomes acceptable to those people who are scared of the restrictions of Islamic beliefs, worship and the Shariah. Although this group has not yet organised itself into a separate and independent party, I do know there is quite a large number of people of such style of thinking and their proposals are now going through madness.

The Drawbacks of the Deviated Paths

By critiquing the methodologies of each and every one of the groups separately, I shall explain what drawbacks they have, how each has deviated from the straight path of Islam and why achieving the real Islamic goal through these detours is ever impossible?

Those Who Prioritise India's Independence

The first group comprises mostly of the religious scholars and people of religious thoughts. And generally, the people of this group are more religious than the people of other groups. And it is because of this reason that I am more astonished by them than the rest. Frightened by the above-mentioned problems, these gentlemen have formed an opinion that in the current circumstances, Islamic goal cannot be achieved and therefore made "India's freedom from the British rule" the objective of their efforts. Inevitably the path changed too with the change of the goal. In every part of the three parts of the straight path of Islam described by me, their way is different:

In the part of the message, Islam's methodology is that people be invited to accept the sovereignty and authority of Allah. But they invite

the inhabitants of India to the sovereignty of the people. They do not reject ungodly sovereignty but only the British. They do not recognise the British sovereignty but instead the autonomy and democratic sovereignty of the inhabitants of the country. Obviously, owing to the polytheist nature there is no difference between British sovereignty and democratic sovereignty. Therefore, their message is not only absolutely unIslamic but rather anti-Islamic. They prefer the sovereignty of the majority of the people of India over the British and the legislation of Indians over the English Law, when the truth is that from the Islamic perspective both are equally rebellious, unIslamic, transgressing and problematic. Then, they take part in fanning the flames of national and patriotic prejudices between the English and the Indian when in reality this is an obstacle in the path of Islam's general message and invitation. In Islam's eyes, both the English and the Indian are human beings. It makes both of them the equal addressee of its message. Its fight with the British is not as to why him being an inhabitant of one country is ruling the people of another country. Rather why would he not accept the sovereignty of God and follow His Law? And this is exactly what its fight against the Indian is as well. It invites both of them to the same thing. Becoming a supporter of one and fighting the other is against its stature. Because if it were to become the supporter of one and the opponent of the other in this national and patriotic fight between the Indian and the English then the door to the heart of the English will be closed for its message. In the part of forming a party, these gentlemen are even more perplexed. First, due to change in the nature of the message, their point of view on the structure and order of the party changed. Then the concept of "Muslim nation" added another reason for them to worry about. Because of these reasons, they gather all kinds of worthless people and at a time scores of contradictory things are manifested from the words and actions of these people. If you rise up in support of a consistent ideology then inevitably who will choose only those people for your party who follow this particular ideology

with total commitment. Contrary to this, when you rise up in support of a confusing and undefined ideology then your standard of selection would be free from those limitations/conditions which are absolutely essential for a consistent ideology. A while ago, I had the opportunity to participate in a meeting where forming a local branch of a very large party of India was being discussed. After debating it for some time the thing that was decided was that membership forms be printed and by making as many members as possible within 15 days, a public meeting be held in which the office-bearers be elected. And voila! The branch is setup. In this way, various kinds of people join these parties merely by filling up the form and paying an annual fees of Rs.4/-. Then by getting elected through the votes of these very people those come to hold the office whose job is guiding and leading. And it is because of the unanimous desires of such people that good and bad policies are made. Can any person expect that any progress towards attaining the Islamic goal be made by this process of forming a party?

iii) Similarly, in the third part too their methodology is deviated from the straight path of Islam. As I have mentioned before, Islam makes a direct assault on the unIslamic system of obedience and it demands that all efforts be focused on proving and establishing the rule of Lord of all the worlds. But contrary to this, they turn their efforts towards destroying the British system of obedience and establishing the sovereignty of the people. This is a clear deviation from the straight path. When this deviation is criticised, they say that the British system of obedience is a huge obstacle in the path of achieving the Islamic goal. We alone cannot remove this obstacle. Hence, let us remove it with the help of others and then it would become easier to advance towards the real goal. But I am unable to understand how it would become easier? Obviously, one system of obedience or Deen cannot be replaced by another Deen until the thought of demolishing the first system and constructing the second system is not firmly established in human souls.

If you were to replace the current British system of obedience

in India with democratic system of obedience then this revolution will be possible only when you firmly instil in the hearts and minds of this country the idea of their own sovereignty instead of British sovereignty and the strong determination of practically becoming the masters of their country. Contrary to this, if you want to establish the divine system of obedience in India then this revolution is not possible unless you convince the public to abdicate their sovereignty, reject the sovereignty of anyone but God and instil in their hearts the belief of Allah being the master of their country (and also the whole world) so firmly that they bow to His authority willingly and happily. Now, the question is how can those, whose ultimate goal is the establishment of the rule of God, take those steps in all seriousness, as the way to achieve their objective whereby they instil in the hearts of the public the belief of their own sovereignty so strongly that by its power the firmly established Deen of the British gets uprooted and the Deen of Democracy establishes itself in its place? Is convincing the people, in whose hearts the belief of their own sovereignty is ensconced, less difficult than uprooting the current British sovereignty? Is the establishment of the rule of God in technically "free" countries like America, Japan, Germany and England any less difficult as it seems to be difficult in technically "slave" countries like India? If the answer to this question is in the negative, and it can certainly be given only in the negative, then I am unable to understand how the establishment of Indian sovereignty be considered a step in the direction of establishing the rule of God?

Nevertheless, if it is to be believed that this strategy could work out, I would still refuse to accept it as correct. It is not necessary that every strategy which is effective is correct as well. Actually, this is a very impure strategy which a Muslim cannot even think of adopting it. How can anyone who truly believes in Allah to be the master of the country (and the world) tolerate to preach to the public, against his own faith, that it is they who are the masters of the country? How could a person who believes that man's individual and social life should be committed

only to the laws of God and a government should be accountable to Him, the goal of all his endeavours regard the authority of the laws of the majority in individual and social life and a government accountable to the majority the objective of all his endeavours? How can the mouth of a truthful person open for the propagation or backing up of an ideology which he himself regards to be untrue and wage a Jihad, with his life and property for the establishment of a thing which in his belief is not true but false?

Whatever I have said is just a proof of the fact that the path of these people is deviated from the straight path of Islam. As for the fact that these people can never achieve the Islamic goal by taking a detour, my argument is that the difficulties whose fear has made them take the detour will remain as they are even after getting freedom from the British rule. Take another look at the difficulties mentioned by me alone – will any one of those get removed even in the period of independent India? If not then these people who are avoiding the straight path out of their lack of wisdom and courage to face the difficulties today will also abstain tomorrow from directly advancing towards the actual Islamic goal. Know it very well that whenever you decide to take a step towards this goal, you will anyhow face these difficulties. Those who have no courage and strategy to face them, cannot move in its direction, not just in the current but any scenario. And for those who have courage and strategy, taking a detour is nothing but waste of time and foolishness. They shall carve a way out of this mountain and advance towards their goal.

People Who Believe in the Idea of Pakistan

The second group is mostly comprised of that class which is intellectually raised in a totally western manner. They take their political thought from western sources, however since hereditarily they have this bias in favour of Islam and a sense of being a "Muslim nation" has awakened in them, whatever they want to do it only in the name of Islam. As a consequence, Islamic terminology and western thoughts got admixed in their speech and action in a strange way. Analysing the

admixture in question and pointing out each and every detail of this amalgamation is beyond the scope of this book. In line with my subject of discussion, I just want to say that like the first group, this group too is deviated from all the three parts of the straight path.

❶ Let us begin with the message. The speeches of their leaders, the resolutions passed by their representative councils, the discussions of their workers, the writings of their writers, all of these things prove that their message in reality is a nationalistic message. Their call is not to the Islamic goal but to safeguard the worldly interests of their nation, by uniting it against the Hindu nation. Just as the pro-independence people have regarded the British their enemy, they have regarded the Hindus as their enemies. From this perspective, they and the pro-independence people are on the same level. However, the thing which made their attitude towards Islam more harmful than the pro-independence folks fight for their nation and national interests while these people frequently invoke the names of Islam and Muslim in their fight because of which Islam has been made into a party to this conflict for no reason and non-Muslim nations are regarding it as their political and economic adversary. In this way they have not only rendered themselves useless to Islam but have also created such a big obstacle in the way of Islamic propagation that if other Muslims might want to do this work, they will find the hearts of non-Muslims locked for Islam. There is no doubt that along with this nationalistic message, they talk about the merits of Islam and the superiority of its principles. However, firstly in the context of nationalism, this gets turned into a matter of national pride instead of an ideological message and furthermore the other things they mix with the message of Islam are totally against Islam. Propagating the formation of Islamic government on one hand but on the other hand supporting "Muslim" states and governments whose system is totally unIslamic. On one hand, explaining Islamic economic system and on the other hand supporting and defending the Qaruns of their own nation. On one hand, ideologically denouncing

human legislation and on the other hand demanding seats in legislative assemblies. On one hand, professing to believe in the sovereignty of Lord of all the worlds and on the other hand worrying about forming one's own national government based on the principle of democratic sovereignty. On one hand refuting the racial, national and patriotic division of mankind and on the other hand screaming nation! nation! all the time and fighting and clashing with other nations based on the principles of nationalism. On one hand, claiming to selflessly follow the truth and on the other hand lamenting and mourning day and night over worldly interests. On one hand, taking pride in Islamic culture and civilisation and boisterous mobilisation and recruitment for its preservation and on the other hand heading and leading the rebels and killers of this very culture and civilisation. After all, how can these two things go hand in hand? When has the world ever been influenced by such contradictions giving it hope that people like these would fly the flag of Islam?

② Now look at how they structure their party. Their rule is that they give the invitation to become members of their party to all those people who are related to the Muslim nation by virtue of their birth. And those who accept the invitation are made of beginner-level members. And then by the votes of these beginner-level members, office-bearers are elected and it is through their votes all matters are decided. Clearly, this methodology can be suitable only to a national organisation and the system created by this methodology could not do anything but try to fulfil the desires of a nation. As for the ideological movement, this methodology of forming a party to build it is not just useless but rather harmful. To assume all the individuals of a nation to be true Muslims just because they are hereditary Muslims and to hope whatever will be done by their collective effort will be done according to the Islamic principle is the first and basic mistake.

The state of affairs of this massive crowd called Muslims is so bad that 999 out of a thousand individuals neither have any knowledge

of Islam nor are aware of the difference between truth and falsehood nor have their moral viewpoint and intellectual attitude altered in accordance with Islam. They are Muslims only because Muslim names have been getting passed down from generation to generation. Neither did they accept truth by recognising it to be the truth nor did they deny falsehood by recognising it to be falsehood. Placing the steering in the hands of their majority vote if someone hopes that the car would drive on the Islamic path then his presumptuousness is admirable.

③ After this, inspect the methodology with which they presumptuously hope to achieve the Islamic goal. Their proposal goes like this – first, let a government of Muslims be formed in Muslim-majority provinces in accordance with that very democratic constitution which the British government wants to implement here. Then efforts be made to gradually turn this national government to an Islamic system of governance* But this is the same kind of mistake which is being made by the pro-independence gentlemen. The objections I have against

* It is worth mentioning at this point that it has never been made clear in any of the resolutions of Muslim League and the speech of their leaders that their ultimate goal is the establishment of Islamic government in Pakistan. On the contrary, the thing which was repeatedly and clearly expressed by them was that they are actually looking to form a democratic government in which other non-Muslim nations too ought to be the stakeholders. However, the Muslim's share shall be higher owing to their majority. In other words, it is quite convincing and satisfying to them that those provinces be freed from Hindu domination where Muslims are in the majority. As for the system of governance then, it shall be the same in "Pakistan" as it is in "India." When an objection was raised against this objective of theirs that this unIslamic government of Muslims was not at all preferable to the unIslamic government of non-Muslims from an Islamic perspective rather it is condemnable, not one of their leaders or office-bearers responded to it. However, those who are considered to be in the lower ranks of Pakistani circle hold no responsible position in the party started to say that when the Muslim-majority gains sovereignty then we shall try to change the system of governance.

their proposal are the same as I have against the proposal of the people of the Pakistani school of thought. They are totally wrong in thinking that the formation of an independent government in Muslim-majority provinces based on the principle of democratic sovereignty will after all be helpful in establishing the rule of God. The Muslim majority which is found in this proposed Pakistan is also found rather a bigger one is found in Afghanistan, Iran, Iraq, Turkey and Egypt; and there the independent government of Muslims is neither helpful nor seems to be in any degree in establishing the rule of God. Let alone being helpful, I ask: can you expect anything other than the punishments of death or exile by preaching the rule of God in those countries? If you had any idea of the conditions and circumstances of those countries you would not dare to answer this question in the affirmative. And when this is the state of affairs then you should ponder the question of what is causing these independent governments of Muslim people to act as stumbling block in the road to the Islamic revolution? No matter how much you investigate this matter, the only answer you will find is that actually being a Muslim technically and hereditarily is one thing and having an Islamic ideology and goal in life is a totally different thing. Even if those people who are not Muslims spiritually and morally but rather only technically and hereditarily gain complete independence from foreign influence and power and if their majority gets the authority to form the government of their choice still the rule of God cannot come into existence. They are the servants of their worldly interests. Not only do they not have the strength to sacrifice their interests for truth and truthfulness. Rather whenever truthy and truthfulness clash with their worldly interests they leave the truth and always go in the direction where their worldly interests are fulfilled. Where there is a majority of such people, there you cannot hope that those righteous would get elected through the votes of such people in the general elections who would rule in accordance with the prophetic methodology. Democratic elections are just like boiling milk to get the layer of cream on top of it.

If the milk is poisonous then the cream derived from it will naturally be more poisonous than the milk. Similarly, if the society is degenerate then only those will get elected to power who could get the certificate of approval from its egotistical desires. Hence, those who suppose that the rule of God will get established when the Muslim-majority areas are liberated from the Hindu majority and when a democratic government is formed are absolutely mistaken. Actually, as a consequence whatever might be gained would be an unIslamic government of Muslims. Calling it the rule of God would be absolutely sacrosanct.

There is no doubt that by preparing the public morally and intellectually, changing their point of view and revolutionising their psychology a democratic system can be turned into the rule of God. However, the question is – would the unIslamic government of the Muslims be of any help in bringing about this moral and psychological revolution? Can you expect from these people who would succeed in gaining the power by appealing to the material interests of this current degenerate society to use the government funds, resources and authority for backing a movement whose mission is to change the public mindset and prepare them for the rule of God? There cannot be any answer to this question but no in the light of reason and experience. Rather the truth is that instead of helping the revolution they would oppose it because they know fully-well that if people's mindset were to change then they have to close their shops in this charged society. Not only this, the more frightening truth is that by virtue of being Muslims-in-name-only they would crush every such effort more boldly and ruthlessly than the unbelievers and their names would be enough to cover up their oppression. When this is the matter then is he not a fool who has the ultimate goal of Islamic revolution but strives for the formation of a democratic government which would be an obstacle in the way bigger than every unIslamic government.

The Proponents of Reforming the Deen

Now, let us take the third group. These people are thinking about different kinds of proposals. Someone wants to create a new and sweet confection by mixing unIslamic thoughts with Islamic thoughts. Someone is deliberating about bringing out a new edition of "Indian Islam." Someone wants to take only the political and economic principles out from the comprehensive system of Islam and form a party on those principles, a party which does not mandate adhering to Islamic beliefs, worship and laws in order to join it. All these people thinking with well-meaning intentions that by this way, gradually the antipathy to Islam will end and when they get a familiarity with some Islam then it would not take long to get a full familiarity with Islam.

But all these thoughts are naïve. Neither in principle can they be considered correct nor in practice do they have any worth? To me, all these proposals are consequences of weak hearts and feeble minds.

In principle, we are not authorised to change, amend, reform, add or delete anything to or from Islam. We are not the owners, creators and legislators of Islam. Islam is not our commodity to make and sell it in the market as per the demand. Our position in relation to Islam is that of followers and preachers. The owner gave us this entire package of beliefs, worship and laws so that we can follow it ourselves and deliver it to others. We do not have any right whatsoever to amend it or change its original form and cast it in a different form. Whoever wants it must take the whole package and, in the form, revealed by its owner. And there is no need to flatter someone or convince him over more or less if he doesn't want to take the package in its comprehensive structure and designated form. Islam is a commandment from the Creator to the creation. The Creator's job is not to flatter or please the creation. The creation has to accept the commandment as it is, otherwise it will only hurt itself; the Creator will not suffer any loss. That's why the messengers sent by Allah in the world, delivered the

entire commandment as it was and clearly said whether it is accepted or rejected nonetheless no change or amendments will be done to it as per the desires of the people. This is exactly our position as well by virtue of being the deputies of the Messenger.

Also, what an irrational proposal it is to pick only the political and economic principles from the comprehensive system of Islam and based on these principles form a party to join which belief in monotheism, the Day of Judgement, Quran and the prophethood is not at all needed nor performing the acts of worship and following the commandments of the Shariah are required. Could a man of insight even conceive of implementing a social ideology and programme of action which are separated from its fundamental philosophy, moral system and character-building pillars?! After all, what does the political system of Islam even mean when the concept of the sovereignty of Allah is taken out from it? If the Quran is not accepted as the source of law and Prophet Muhammad (peace be upon him) as the only authentic link between the subject (man) and the King (Allah) for the communication of laws and commandments then will the Islamic-styled state be created on air?! Moreover, what kind of a system of civilisation and politics can be established without taking any support from a moral system? Also, after taking out the concept of man's accountability to God will any moral support remain for this system of civilisation and politics as outlined by Islam? Can you run this system on the strength of materialistic morality even for a day? Furthermore, how can that particular kind of individual character and social life which are required for this system of civilisation and politics be produced without prayer, Zakat, fasting and Hajj? If these are absent then how can this system even work? Therefore, this is extreme intellectual bankruptcy to say that a tree can be grown without roots only because the leaves are pretty.

Practically too, these proposals are totally wrong. The main danger posed by them is losing the way to reach the real destination. The so-called reformed Islam, which will be preached, will one day

itself become the actual standard. And those who join the party by believing in it not only refuse to turn to the real Islam but rather those expedient Muslims who had made a deal with them will join them in their misguidance. This is the flaw in things founded on compromises.

Analysis of the Problems

Now, we need to take a look at those problems scared of which they are resorting to deviant ways. Are these problems truly what they are which cannot be solved?

In order to avoid repetition, I shall once again trouble the readers to turn the pages back and take a glance at that part of the chapter in which I have explained the problems.

First Problem

The summary of the first problem is that Islam not only provides solutions to political, economic and civilisational problems but also gives a set of beliefs, acts of worship and rules. And accepting it means a complete change in man's life. It is said that this thing does not allow Islam to spread as other movements do. However, the problem is as weak and unreal from the inside as it seems powerful on the outside. The truth is that there is no such social ideology and doctrine in the world which gives abstract solutions to the practical problems of human life and along with that does not have its own peculiar philosophy and some beliefs. There are some metaphysical problems about which forming either a negative or a positive opinion is nonetheless inevitable which resolves to create a course of action for man. All these questions like what is the nature of the system of the universe? What is man's status in this system? What is the end result of man's life? And that everything in the world is for man but who is man for? All these are actually fundamental questions and without providing a workable solution to these questions no intellectual, moral, educational and civilisational system could be created. And no man can work with merely the practical aspects of a system unless he accepts

its basic philosophy; in other words, its beliefs too. So, having a system of beliefs is not exclusive to Islam alone. If there is an obstacle in the path of Islam for that reason then such an obstacle is found in the path of every doctrine too. Every social doctrine is in reality a religion and whoever follows it is actually leaving one religion and embracing the other even though he might say and think out of naiveté that he is following his previous religion as usual.

I shall explain this point further by a simple example. Take this communism, which we are seeing these days, as an example. If Islam starts its doctrine with the metaphysical view that God exists then communism starts with the view that God does not exist or at least His existence is outside the scope of its discussion. If Islam takes this view that this world is God's kingdom and man is a subject to His command here, then communism adopts the view that this world is just a coincidence and man is absolutely independent. If Islam takes the position that man needs God's guidance to live in this world and that guidance comes through revelation then communism takes the position that he needs no guidance and there is no such thing called revelation. If Islam begins from the point that there is another life after this life in which human beings will be held accountable for all they said and did in their current lives then communism begins from the point that this is the only life and after this there neither is any life nor accountability. These two are equally metaphysical views and none of them can be proved with experimentation or observation. Now if without any scientific proof people who were not communists yesterday but are now able to accept the views of communism merely on the basis of argumentation and intuition then the question is why can't those people who are not Muslims today accept the views of Islam based on argumentation and intuition tomorrow?

In the same way, believing in a guide is common to both the ideologies. If believing in Prophet Muhammad (peace be upon him) is essential to be a Muslim then a Communist too believes in Marx. And

if a person who was not a Marxist until yesterday could accept Marx as his guide by looking at his teachings then what could be hindering a person who was not a Muslim until yesterday, from accepting Prophet Muhammad (peace be upon him) his guide by looking at his teachings and works?

This is the same case with party discipline too. If Islam makes the people who join its party adhere to some of its rules then does not the Communist party bound those who join it to its set of rules and regulations? So, when a lot of people accept to follow the rules and regulations of the Communist party by believing in the principles of communism then what horrible hobgoblin is hidden in the party discipline of Islam that when people get ready to believe in its principles after examining them this hobgoblin would come out from hiding and scare them away by showing its face?

It becomes clear from this example that the belief in God and His unity or the belief in the Day of Judgement or the indispensable leadership of the Prophet and the belief in the Quran as the final source of law being prerequisites and prayer, fasting, zakat and Hajj being mandatory are not the things which are obstacles in the spread of Islam or non-Muslims getting pulled towards it. Metaphysical beliefs and party discipline are also found in other doctrines as well and those people who find the solution to the problems of their lives as per their own understanding, in these doctrines accept the beliefs and rules of the doctrines as well. Then there is no reason that if Islam were to present the best solution to all their life-problems and open to them the path to their success and happiness then the pre-condition of beliefs and rules in it should prove to be an extraordinary impediment to them. If there is an impediment then it is only to the extent that generally it is hard for people to leave their old way of life and embrace a new one. However, any movement which spreads in the world will at any rate face such hindrances and those who believe in any movement will anyhow move forward by overcoming these barriers. Only he tries

to take a detour in the face of a problem who is either not truthful to his faith or foolish or without any courage. However, the thing which did intensify this obstacle against Islam is this static, rigid and lifeless religiosity which is nowadays understood to be Islam.

The first basic flaw in this lifeless religiosity is that the beliefs of Islam have been turned into suppositions of a religion when the truth is, they are the foundations of the logic of a complete social philosophy and system of civilisation. And similarly, its acts of worship have been turned into mere rites and rituals and meditations when the fact is they are the means to strengthen and solidify the intellectual and moral foundations upon which Islam has built its social system. The consequence of this act of distortion is that people are struggling to understand as to what is the need for these beliefs and acts of worship to enforce a political, economic and civilisational programme of action?!

The second basic flaw in this distorted religiosity is that the Shariah has been turned into a frozen Shashtra. The door of Ijtihad has been closed for centuries in this religiosity because of which Islam has been turned into a vestige of the bygone era and institutions providing Islamic education have been turned into archives departments of ancient monuments. Obviously, strangers could express their appreciation by looking at it based on their increasing historical taste but they cannot be expected to feel the need for getting guidance for the strategy of the past and creation of the future.

The third important flaw is the sickness to measure every detail, determine the values inadequately and pivot religiosity to the letter of the Deen rather than the spirit which is extremely severe in this distorted religiosity. And let alone winning over other people, it has become the cause of repelling them. By looking at the lives of the standard-bearers of this wrong religiosity and listening to them a man begins to muse whether his success and failure depends on these little things which is emphasised by these people this much?

This is a very big obstacle in the way of Islam. But this is not Islam's fault but ours. And it is our responsibility to change our educational system which has rendered the concept of Deen so wrong and the knowledge of Shariah so static. Obviously, a living movement cannot be built on the strength of dead beliefs. We need to present these beliefs with logical arguments, explain the logical link between beliefs, acts of worship and laws has to be explained and proved by applying these laws to the practical problems in life, that the solution to all the human needs is present in these laws. Only then people could understand this system to be rational and when they understand it, they would also be willing to accept it. Since this constructive work is demanding, people turn to already well-established ways but do not think that one has to go all the trouble to make one's own way to reach one's goal. And if we are true to our mission then we have to be prepared for this task.

Second Problem

Now take the second problem. By analysing the prejudices which are said to be obstacles in the way of Islam, it emerges that:

One kind of prejudice is that which is naturally found in every person against anything which is new to him, anything which he did not find his ancestors doing and with which he is not familiar. This prejudice is not an obstacle in the way of Islam only today but it was before too. And as I have pointed out above, this obstacle is not in the way of Islam alone but also every other movement. Currently, this is not an obstacle which cannot be removed. Despite this obstacle, Islam spread in the past and will spread today too.

The other kind of prejudice is that which is actually not against Islam but rather against Muslims and because of its relation with Muslims it became an obstacle in the way of Islam as well. The fires of all these prejudices were actually fanned by unIslamic ways adopted by Muslims for the past many centuries for the fulfilment of their egotistical desires and the expression of the unIslamic character in

their individual and social behaviours even today.

Who could deny the fact that India never had the chance to taste the real Islamic rule, pure Islamic morals and true Islamic civilisation. The example of Islam set by Muslim emperors, nobles, rulers, officials, soldiers, landlords, elite and the public through their conduct was never something which could make the common people of this country enamoured of Islam. As a matter of fact, the centuries long tensions going on between them and their non-Muslim counterparts for selfish reasons, created constant historical prejudices against Islam.

Apart from this historical background, the example of Islam being set by the Muslims through their individual and social conduct even today is not that pretty which could make the people fall in love with this movement which is being represented with such pomp. In his individual life, in what way a common Muslim is superior to a common non-Muslim that people may get curious to search for the source of this superiority? Can even a small glimmer be seen from his attitude, morals and conduct which tells that this person follows superior and pure principles? Is a Muslim landlord or a "noble" compared to technical "ignoble" any less haughty than his non-Muslim counterpart? Is a Muslim businessman or professional more religious than his non-Muslim counterpart? Does a Muslim ruler or official follow any better moral principles than his non-Muslim counterpart in exercising his authority? Are Muslim employees aren't following all those despicable ways day and night which are being followed by their non-Muslim counterparts too? Is not being biased in the favour of their own nation legitimately or illegitimately, trying to harm non-Muslims through those same mean tactics and dying over these small worldly interests, which they complain about the non-Muslims, not their own occupation too? And when a non-Muslim does not see any sign of superiority in these representatives of Islam, when he sees them doing all those things which he himself does and when he sees them fighting and

quarrelling over all those things which he himself fights and quarrels over then what could attract him to the ideology which they represent? Rather, when in the arena of selfishness and worship of the world they are equal competitors then why would he even feel the need to think about the ideology of his rival with open-mindedness? On one hand, there is the past historical prejudices and on the other hand this current selfish tension, are these two not enough to lock the doors of his heart?

In the wider national sphere of individual life what is the policy a Muslim is so insistent on rather deems it to be the guarantor of his social life? The principles and objectives of Islam are not even mentioned. You cannot even find a phrase in any sermon, speech or resolution which may show that these people have universal principles and have stood up for the well-being of human beings and not for their own selfish and worldly interests and that their fight is only for the truth. Rather you would find that a totally equal nationalistic war is waging on between them and other nations. Both of them have come down to the same level, are fighting for the same level of worldly interests, using the same kind of tactics, language, terminologies, contending, crying and squabbling over the same things. Then how can it be understood that those people with whom you are fighting for worldly interests on an equal level, with whom you have an old and fresh relationship of antagonism and rivalry and with whom you are at war for the same political and economic interests, would be willing to carefully and open mindedly think about the message of an ideological movement from you just as they would be ready for communism or Democracy?

These prejudices are another great obstacle in the way of Islam. But the cure for them is not that we keep the cause of these prejudices alive and by using it as an excuse turn away from directly advancing in the direction of one's goal. Rather the right cure is that we need to change our individual and social behaviours and by cutting these prejudices at their roots in this way need to prepare the straight path towards the goal. Those people who by seeing Hindu, Sikh, Christian,

Zoroastrian prejudices and the prejudices of all the nations spread against Islam and therefore superficially pass the verdict that Islam in such circumstances cannot spread in its capacity of a pure and ideological movement are looking at facts in the wrong light and hence are arriving at wrong conclusions. As I have proved above, these fires of prejudices were not fanned by Islam and Islamic character (which these nations in India had little chance to experience) but rather were produced as a result of the attitude of the wrong representatives of Islam who despite being Muslim have been following unIslamic ways and instead of working for Allah sincerely have been working for their own worldly and selfish desires. Therefore, the correct way to redress these prejudices is to represent Islam correctly through our character, actions and collective struggle rather than arguing over sticking to that very wrong attitude and using these prejudices as an excuse, an attitude which created these prejudices in the first place. Suppose if it is to be believed that owing to national prejudices it is impossible for Islam to operate as a pure ideological movement then the question is can the prejudices be ever removed, till the Day of Judgement because of the tension brewing between you and other nations for the worldly interests of Muslims instead of Islamic interests and the same nationalistic ways adopted by you in response to their nationalistic ways? If not then do not say it is because of some peculiar circumstances that Islam cannot operate as a purely ideological movement. Rather say there will be such circumstances in the future too. And if Islam were to remain merely your family inheritance then like the children of Israel it will always be your national religion and can never become a universal mission.

It is a demand from human nature that selfishness begets selfishness and nationalism begets nationalism. Contrary to this, in response to selfless devotion to truth all antagonistic sentiments and prejudices lay their weapons down in the end and in the face of a truthful and selfless person devoted to truth, a man is unable to present anything other than love and devotion. If Muslims had maintained

their position which actually was theirs originally then it would not have been possible for these prejudices to be found against them in India about which they are complaining today. But they themselves have lost this position. They began to fight other nations for worldly advantages and instead of the principles of truth made their personal and national interests the pivot of their struggle. If prejudice was not created in the hearts of other nations as a response then it would have been very strange. You yourselves do not adhere to the principles you talk about. Rather you break them night and day in your personal and social lives. You talk about a high mission but you practically don't struggle for it. Rather your individuals individually and your society socially ignores it and runs after other goals in life. In such a scenario if your appeal is ineffective in drawing people's attention to your imaginary goal and principles made of words but no substance and if by regarding your appeal to be a lie and your propagation to be a selfish tactic reject it in disdain, then what is so appalling about it?

Obviously, no non-Muslim could believe in Mr. Jinnah's 14 or 24 points nor is there anything in the resolutions of Muslim League or Majlis-e-Ahrar-ul-Islam or Jamiat-ul-Ulama which anyone could have faith in. If anyone could believe in anything then it is 'There is no god but Allah' provided a party committed to live and die for it is available to him. But where is it? What party is there among you which has made genuine devotion to truth its ideology and the establishment of pure religion of truth the focus and pivot of its endeavours? People see the message of Islam and its principles of truth in books and begin to acknowledge and appreciate it. However, they do not find any society running on it and for it. Then where are they supposed to go? Should they go to a society which just drools and dies for the world day and night and follows the ways of the non-Muslims? One of your parties fights because Indian rule should get established instead of the British. This is exactly what a person can get in non-Muslim parties. Then why would he come to you? Another of your parties fights so as to safeguard

the worldly interests of hereditary Muslims against the Hindus. He finds this thing to be against his own nationalism. Then why would he leave his own nationalism and believe in yours? Where is the party among you which could liberate man from the authority of anyone or anything but Allah so that people could believe in its principles and objectives and step forward to join it?

Third Problem

The biggest puzzle which our intelligentsia is unable to solve is that millions of people live here who are neither totally Muslim nor non-Muslim. Because of the presence of these people in such a situation, a number of complicated problems have arisen, the solution to which the people are unable to find and because of which both the leaders and the cadre are all in total disarray. I shall point to those few big confusions as examples which this situation has created:

Some people, by getting deceived by the word Muslim, are under the wrong impression that the real question is not about the revival of Islam but of the Muslims. They misunderstand that the real objective is to revive a people who go by the name of Muslim, turn them into a strong nation and take them to the heights of power. And to them this is what the revival of Islam means. This misconception led to the extremes of "Muslim nationalism." Just as for Moonje and Savarkar, the question is of the glory of Hindu nation, in which they were born and with which their destiny is linked, the real question for these "Muslim nationalists" is the glory of "Muslim nation" in which they are born. They think that to serve Islam is to spend all their energy on the education of Muslims (regardless of the kind of education), their economic prosperity (regardless of the means of earning it) their political and military organisation (purely national organisation) and make them into a great nation. When this became their mission, they began to look at matters from the perspective of what strategies would help them in reaching their goal and began to use strategies unreservedly which they saw to be effective in achieving national glory in the world

regardless of how far they might take them away from Islam. Even to this day, this mindset has held sway over most of the leaders, workers, and institutions of Muslims since the days of Sir Syed Ahmed Khan. Whatever is being thought about today in the name of Islam is being thought for Muslims and free from the regulation of Islam.

There are some other people who although do not mix Islam and Muslims in this way link the future of Islam with the current hereditary Muslims in a different way. They do want the revival of Islam but they believe that Islam's revival is dependent on all the Muslims (who are currently Muslims hereditarily) becoming full Muslims. They think that unless and until all these Muslims do not change intellectually, morally and practically, not a single step can be taken to move forward. And since this looks quite difficult rather impossible, they are wasting their energies here and there on useless things pursuing secondary goals instead of advancing towards the real goal.

There are some other people to whom the Islamic goal has become almost clear to them and they want to move in its direction too but they are constantly worried about this question: if our thinking minds and working hands were to be totally involved in the struggle for the Islamic goal then what would happen to the political and economic interests of our nation in the current unIslamic system of civilisation, politics and the upcoming upheaval? This question is so important to them that by postponing their journey they say that first of all this question must be dealt with and steps in the direction of the real goal be taken only when no issue of our nation remains unresolved.

However, all these confusions are the product of unIslamic way of thinking and mentality. If seen from a purely Muslim perspective then no confusion will remain a confusion for us. To us, the real question is not the revival of any nation but the ideology of Islam. The moment the thought of the revival of a nation is removed from the mind all those problems which worry those who think in nationalistic terminologies, will evaporate like camphor. When we are the followers

of the ideology of Islam and promoting it is our goal then we cannot have any interest or sympathy with any such "interests" which are associated with an unIslamic system or that are in conflict with the principles of Islam. We shall not trouble ourselves with thinking about it. We shall not have anything to do with all these strategies for national revival which are based on unIslamic principles. We shall disassociate ourselves from the mutual conflict between one nation and other nations or the endeavours of one nation dominating the other. We shall only be interested in the Islamic system of thought and action, its propagation and the efforts to make it dominant. Our relationship with Muslims will be only to the extent of their relationship with Islam. Whoever abandons servitude to his selfish desires and anyone or anything regardless of whether he comes from hereditary Muslims or non-Muslims. We shall invite a hereditary Muslim as well to the same ideology as we invite a non-Muslim. In our view, Islam is not linked to the Muslims that it stands when they stand and sits when they sit. Islam is not their ancestral property. If they are willing to live and die for it then we are happy and our God is happy otherwise they can go and fall into whichever pit of hell they want, we on the other hand shall take the word of God to the people.

Whatever I am saying here was exactly the conduct of the prophets and messengers and this was also the way of Prophet Muhammad (peace be upon him). Those who were called as "the people of the Book" were after all hereditary Muslims. They used to believe in God, the angels, prophets, the divine books and the Day of Resurrection and used to customarily follow the acts of worship and commandments too. However, the real spirit of Islam i.e. making the servitude and obedience exclusively to Allah and not to associate anyone or anything with Him, left them. Now, did the Prophet (peace be upon him) focus his efforts on reviving this "hereditary Muslim nation"? No! Did he make a resolution that unless and until all these hereditary Muslims become true Muslims, no step will be taken? No

again! Did he postpone the effort to establish the Deen until the worldly problems of these “hereditary Muslims” were solved? Not even this. Then what did he do? Everyone knows that by disregarding all the issues and problems, he invited the “hereditary Muslims”, non-Muslims and everyone else to the pure servitude to Allah. Whoever accepted it and renounced servitude and obedience to other than Allah was included in his party and he directly strove with them for the establishment of the divine system of obedience i.e. the true Deen until he ended up establishing it.

This is the exact methodology the following of which I regard to be correct. I want to follow it and would suggest it to all those whose goal is Islamic.



The Process of Islamic Revolution

IN THIS DISCOURSE I shall explain to you the process by which an Islamic State comes into being as a natural consequence of a particular set of circumstances. Now-a-days the phrase "Islamic State" has become a child's plaything; the idea has caught the imagination of certain people, and some of them even profess to have adopted it as a positive ideal. But such strange methods are being suggested for its attainment as would make it as impossible to reach the desired goal as reaching America in a motor car. This loose thinking is due to the fact that owing to certain political and historical causes, a desire has sprung up for a certain ideal which may be called the "Islamic State"; but no attempt has been made either to define in a scientific manner the nature of this state or to study the process of its evolution. In these circumstances it becomes doubly necessary to investigate this problem in a scientific manner.

Natural Evolution of the State System

In this gathering of educated people I need not spend much time in explaining that a state, whatever its nature, is not formed by artificial means; it is not an article of manufacture to be prepared at a particular place and then transplanted elsewhere entirely at the sweet will of men. It is rather a natural product of the interplay of certain moral, psychological, cultural and historical factors pre-existing in a place. Certain pre-requisites must be fulfilled, certain social forces created and some natural requirements satisfied before it can come

into being by the pressure of events. Just as in Logic, deduction always follows the arrangement of premises; in Chemistry a chemical compound is formed by the combination, in a particular way, of certain ingredients possessing chemical affinity; likewise it is an undeniable fact that in Sociology a state is merely the natural consequence of the circumstances which pre-exist in a particular society. Again, the nature of state is wholly determined by the nature of the circumstances which underlie its birth and formation. Just as it is not possible that premises may be of one type and their arrangement may bring about a different conclusion; chemical components may be of a particular nature and by mixing them up a compound of a totally different kind may be obtained; a lemon seed may be sown and a tree bearing mangoes may grow out of it; similarly it is not possible that conditions may exist favouring the growth of a particular type of state and the manner of their mutual interaction may also suit the development of the same type of state but, after passing through various evolutionary stages, an altogether different state may emerge out of the process; and the operation of the very forces which favoured one form of state may result in a state being established which belongs to a different category altogether.

Please do not imagine that I am bringing in the doctrine of Determinism here and denying the freedom of human will. There is no doubt that in determining the nature of a state the volition and actions of individuals and communities play a very great part. What I am driving at is that whatever the nature of the state system that is desired to be created, it is indispensable to adopt and choose such means as fit in with the nature and spirit of the desired system and then to hit upon the appropriate course of action leading towards it. It is essential that a particular type of movement should grow up permeated by the same spirit; the same sort of mass character should be moulded; the same type of communal morality should be developed; the same kinds of workers should be trained, and the same type of leadership should

emerge; and such collective action taken as is inherent in the nature of the particular state system desired to be set up. It is only when all these means have been successfully employed and all the necessary forces and appropriate factors have continued to operate for a sufficient period of time and when, as a result of their operation over a considerable period, they have created a social pattern strong enough to withstand all influences foreign to its spirit, then there comes into being, as a natural sequence of this train of events, that particular type of state for which these powerful forces have prepared the ground. This is exactly as a tree springs out of a seed and continues to grow with its own force, so that on reaching a particular stage of development it begins to bear the self-same fruit for which its natural structure was particularly suited. If you consider this fact, you will recognise that when a particular type of movement, leadership, mass-character and communal morality have emerged into a shape appropriate to a definite form of state system and yet the hope is entertained that, as a consequence thereof, a state system of an altogether different nature will be created, it would be little more than wishful thinking.

The Ideological State

We have now to consider what is the nature of the state which we call an Islamic state. In this connection I may point out that the distinguishing mark of the Islamic state is its complete freedom from all traces of nationalism and its influences, direct and indirect. It is a state built exclusively on principles. I should call it an ideological state. A state having its foundations in certain recognised moral principles and free from all idea of nationality or race is one which the world has known but once only and the advantages of which it does not appreciate even to this day. In ancient times men knew only of government by families or classes. Later on, they had experience of racial and national governments. But the idea of a state conducted on a definite set of principles and ruled by a group of persons compose of widely differing

nationalities who have accepted those principles as the basis of their entire life, social, economic and political--such acceptance of principles being their sole title to have a voice in the affairs of the state, this has never struck root in the narrow mind of man. Christianity did embody a very dim perception of this truth but it could not develop a full system of ideas on the basis of which such a state could be formed...In the French Revolution we discover a faint glimpse of the idea of a state founded on a set of principles, but it soon disappeared in the darkness of nationalism. Communism of course preached this gospel with deep fervour and did even attempt to form a state on this basis, so that the world began to take interest in the great Russian experiment. But the evil spirit of nationalism soon possessed the Communist state and injected its poison down to its roots. From the dawn of history down to modern days, Islam is the only system in the world which seeks to organise the state on the basis of an ideology free from all traces of nationalism and invites mankind to form a non-national state by accepting its ideological basis.

As this is something novel and the world around us is moving in a contrary direction not only the non-Muslims but even Muslims themselves are unable to realise its full implications. The idea completely eludes the grasp of those Muslims who, though born in Muslim families, have had their training and education on Western lines and whose views on life and history are borrowed from the European history and Western politics. The result has been that in, countries outside India, where Muslims preponderate and which are more or less independent, when people of this type assumed the reins of government, they could think of no other form of government or state system except a national government and national state. This was because they had no knowledge of Islam and its attitude towards the problems of life and no conception of a state formed on a definite set of moral and spiritual principles instead of the principle of race or nationality. In India too,

people who have received the same kind of mental training are involved in the same fallacy. They talk of an Islamic state but, because of their peculiar mental training and their background of Western political history, they have before their mind no plan of life except that derived from the life and history of a national state in Europe. Consciously or unconsciously, they fall a victim to nationalistic ideology; and whatever programme they think of is fundamentally nationalistic. According to them, the nature of the problem that confronts us is no more than this: that Muslims are a separate national group like Hindus, Englishmen and Frenchmen and as such they have every right to a separate national existence under a state and government of their own. However much they may rack their brains, they cannot conceive of any other means of attaining this objective except that, as a nation, Muslims should follow the same methods and adopt the same strategy as have been followed and adopted by all other national groups in history. In other words, the elements of which this nationality is composed should first be welded together in a strong unified whole; a powerful national spirit should then be infused among them; a central authority should emerge and direct them; they should organise their own national guards; they should have a national militia; wherever they are in a majority they should form a national state based on the well-known democratic principle of majority rule; and wherever they may be in a minority, their "rights" should be safeguarded and their individuality protected, just as in other countries of the world national minorities seek and claim such protection: in the services, educational institutions and elected bodies, they should have proportionate representation, their representatives should be elected by their own votes; and they should be given their due share in ministries as a distinct national entity. Such are the methods and ideas of these people. They are evidently borrowed from the conception of European state system and yet those who advocate the above means and strategy talk, in the same breath, of their resolve to form an Islamic state. These people also use Islamic terms, 'Ummah'

`Millat', `Ameer' and the duty of `obedience to the Ameer' the meaning of which in Islamic terminology is something quite different from what these persons have in mind when they use these words. To them, however, these Islamic terms are synonymous with the terminology of nationalism and, as good luck would have it, these terms were found ready-made in Islamic literature and are now being freely used to serve as a cloak for un-Islamic ideas and modes of action derived from the West.

If you understand the nature of a state based on spiritual and moral principles, you will find little difficulty in realising that this attitude of thought and action and this programme of work cannot serve even as a starting point for arriving at the desired goal of an ideological state, let alone the question of its utility in the concluding stages of the movement. Rather such ideas and actions are by their very nature fatal to the growth and evolution of a state to be founded on non-national principles. The very basis of an ideological state is that we dismiss all questions of tribes, classes, and `nationalities and look upon men as moral and spiritual beings. It is not with their nationality but with their humanity that we concern ourselves. We place before them certain principles of action and a set of beliefs wherefrom they have been derived, and put forward the claim that these principles provide the basis of a universal culture and a non-national state system which will lead mankind to real peace in this world and in the Hereafter. Anyone who accepts those principles is entitled to an equal share in the conduct of the state system built on them. How can a man whose numerous activities bear the stamp of nationalism come forward with such an ideal? How can he appeal to the wider humanity and the common moral sentiments of mankind when he has already falsified his position by associating himself with the good of a particular community or a particular nation? Would it not be ridiculous to appeal in the name of humanity and the common welfare of mankind to people blinded by

national prejudices and fighting each other in the name of nationalism and national states, and in the same breath to demand national rights and national self-determination for our, own people? Does it stand to reason that a movement for dissuading people from litigation should be launched by instituting a suit in a court of law?

The Divine Caliphate

Another distinguishing feature of the Islamic state is that the basic conception underlying all its outward manifestations is the idea of Divine sovereignty. Its fundamental theory^{*} is that the earth and all that it contains belongs to God Who alone is its Sovereign. No individual, family, class or nation, not even the whole of humanity can lay claim to sovereignty, either partially or wholly. God alone has the right to legislate and give commands. The state, according to Islam, is nothing more than a combination of men working together as servants of God to carry out His Will and Purposes. This can happen in two ways: either some person should receive the law of the state and its basic constitution directly from God or he should follow the lead of another person who is the recipient of such law and constitution, In the working of the state all those will participate who believe in this law and are prepared to follow it. They will all work with a sense of individual and collective responsibility to God, not to the electorate, neither to the king nor the dictator. They will proceed on the belief that God knows everything overt and covert; from His knowledge nothing is hidden; and from His grip man can never hope to escape, not even after death: The responsibility for running the state has been vested in men not for the purpose of enforcing their own orders or imposing their own will on others, enslaving people of other nationalities, calling upon them to bow down their heads in submission, enabling them to construct spacious palaces by fleecing the weak and downtrodden; in short,

^{*} See my booklet *Political Theory of Islam* (Urdu: *Islam Ka Nazariya-e- Siyasi*) for detailed discussion on this topic.

for the pursuit of their pleasure and self-glorification. On the other hand, men who are at the helm of the state should have a feeling that this is a burden laid on them that they may enforce the Divine law and administer social justice to the creatures of God. They should feel that if they make even a small mistake in following and enforcing the law or become guilty of even a grain of selfishness, prejudice, partiality and dishonesty, they shall be hauled up before the throne of God on the Day of Judgment, even if they escape punishment in this world.

The superstructure of social conduct and political action that is raised on the basis of this theory is entirely different from that of the secular state in all its details and ramifications. Between these two forms of social and political life there is nothing common either in the elements which make up their unity or in the spirit and attitude underlying them. A state system based on belief in the sovereignty of God and in a sense of responsibility to Him requires for its successful working a special type of individual mass character and a peculiar mental attitude. Its army, its police, its law-courts, its revenue system, its taxation, its administrative and foreign policy, its conduct of war and peace-everything differs widely from its counterpart in a secular state. The ordinary judges as well as the Chief Budes of the secular courts are not fit to work as clerks or even peons in its judicial system. The Inspector General of police in a secular state is not worthy of being an ordinary constable therein; and the Generals and Field-marsals not fit to be recruited as ordinary soldiers. The foreign ministers of the secular states, not to say of their fitness for any office under the Islamic state system, will not escape imprisonment under that system for their falsehood, fraud and dishonesty. In short, all persons who have been trained for running the affairs of secular state and whose moral and mental training has been undertaken in the spirit which permeates every activity of the secular state are totally unfit for an Islamic state, which requires human beings of a very different character for its citizens, voters, councilors, office-bearers, judges, magistrates,

heads of departments, commanders of the army, ambassadors, and ministers-in brief, for all the different elements of its collective life and administrative machinery. It requires men who have the fear of God in their hearts; who feel a sense of responsibility towards God; who prefer the next life to the present; in whose eyes moral gain or loss is much more important than worldly success or failure; who follow implicitly, in every walk of life, the-code of conduct and line of action which has been permanently formulated for them; whose struggle and efforts are directed to the attainment of Divine pleasure; who, are influenced neither by personal nor national motives; who are not slaves to avarice of their sensual passions; who are free from narrow-mindedness and prejudice; whom wealth and authority cannot corrupt; who are neither hungry for riches nor greedy of power; who possess a strength of character that can resist all temptations even if the entire resources of the earth and all the treasures of the world are placed at their free disposal with nobody to check and -supervise -them; who pass sleepless nights when the government of a city is entrusted to them so that, under their protection, people may be freed from all fear in respect of their life, property and honour; who entering a country as conquerors, set at rest by their conduct any fear that may be entertained about them that they will indulge in loot and plunder, in tyranny, adultery or sexual incontinence. On the other hand, the conquered population find, in every soldier of their army, a guardian of their life and property and the honour of their women folk; whose reputation in international politics is such that the whole world can depend upon them for their truthfulness, love of justice, adherence to moral principles, and fulfilment of promises and undertakings. An Islamic state can only be formed with this type of people and it is only men of such sterling character that can run it. People with materialistic and utilitarian mentality who always come forward with new principles under the stress of personal or national expediency; who do not believe in God or in the life Hereafter; whose policy revolves on the axis of worldly gain or

loss, far from being fit to establish or govern such a state are a menace to its stability. Their very existence in such a state is a challenge to the principles on which it claims to rest.

The Method of Islamic Revolution

Keeping in mind the nature of the Islamic state as explained above; let us consider the means to be employed for bringing it into being. As I have pointed out in the beginning, the ideological, moral and cultural conditions existing in a society bring forth by their interplay the type of state suited to them. It is not possible that a tree may shape as a lemon from its rudimentary stages right up to the state of its completion but when it reaches the stage of fruition, it should all of a sudden begin producing mangoes. An Islamic state does not spring into being all of a sudden like a miracle; it is inevitable for its creation that in the beginning there should grow up a movement having for its basis the view of life, the ideal of existence, the standard of morality, and the character and spirit which is in keeping with the fundamentals of Islam. Its leaders and workers should be men who psychologically and spiritually are fit to accept this particular mould of character. They should then, by ceaseless efforts, create the same mental attitude and moral spirit among the people and on the basis of moral and intellectual tendencies so created they should build up a system of education to train and mould the masses in the Islamic pattern of life. The system would produce Muslim scientists, Muslim philosophers, Muslim historians, Muslim economists and financial experts, Muslim jurists and politicians; in short, in every branch of knowledge there should be men who have imbibed the Islamic ideology and are imbued deeply with its spirit, men who have the ability to build a complete system of thought and practical life based on Islamic principles and who have strength enough to challenge effectively the intellectual leadership* of the present Godless thinkers and scientists. With such an intellectual

* See my booklet *New System of Education* (Urdu: *Naya Nizam-e-Taleem*)

background the movement should take the field against the wrong system of life which is to be found all around us over the wide world. In this struggle its torch-bearers should furnish proof of their moral strength and sincerity by facing adversities, braving dangers and by offering sacrifices in money and lives. They must go through all forms of trials and emerge like pure gold which every one may declare unalloyed after having it tested. During their struggle they should by word and deed exemplify in their conduct and bearing, that particular ideology which, they claim to represent. In everything they say or do, it should be apparent to all who come into contact with them that the ideological state to which these selfless, truthful and God-fearing men of pure character and sacrificing spirit are inviting the world must certainly be a guarantee of social justice and world peace. Through such struggle all those elements in society whose nature is not entirely devoid of truth and justice will be attracted to the movement. The influence of people of low mentality and those who resort to mean tricks will disappear to a palpable degree in the face of a lofty movement like this. A revolution will take place in the mentality of the masses and the collective life of humanity will cry out for a state system like this, so that after a time it will become impossible in the changed society of the day for any other system of life to maintain its existence. Ultimately, as an inevitable and natural consequence, that particular state system will be set up for which the ground has been prepared in this manner; and as soon as this system is set up, office-bearers from the lowest officials right up to ministers and administrators of every rank and status will be available for running it through the out-turn of that particular system of education and training which I have mentioned above.

Gentlemen! This is the natural method for bringing about that revolution and setting up that state system which is called the Islamic Revolution and the Islamic state. You are all men of learning; the history of revolutions in the world is before you. You cannot be unaware of the fact that a particular type of revolution demands the same type

of movement, the same type of leaders and workers, and the same type of social consciousness and cultural and moral atmosphere. The French Revolution needed that particular kind of moral and mental basis which leaders like Rousseau, Voltaire and Montesquieu had prepared. The Russian Revolution could only be brought about by the ideas of Marx, the leadership of Lenin and Trotsky and thousands of other Communist workers whose lives were cast in the Communist mould. The National-Socialism of Germany could only take root in the moral, psychological and cultural conditions which had been created by theories of leaders of thought like Hegel, Fichte, Goethe, Nietzsche and many others including Hitler. Exactly in the same way the Islamic Revolution can be brought about only when a mass movement is initiated based on the theories and conceptions of the Qur'an and example and practice of Muhammad (peace be upon him) which would, by a powerful struggle, effect a wholesale change in the intellectual, moral, psychological, and cultural foundations of social life. It passes my understanding how any movement of a nationalistic character with its background of an imperfect educational system like the one prevalent amongst us, which is based on utilitarian morals and pure opportunism, can ever bring about the Islamic Revolution. I do not believe in the kind of miracles in which M. Reynaud, the former Premier of France, believed*. I believe that the means employed in securing an end inevitably leave their effect on the results produced.

Loose Thinking

There is a misunderstanding amongst us that if the Muslims are fully organised and develop a solidarity of their own, that would be a panacea for all our ills. It is thought that, in order to reach the desired goal of the Islamic state or of "free Islam in free India", the only means that need be adopted are that individual comprising the

* Mr Reynaud, who was the Prime Minister of France during the present war, said in a radio broadcast a few days before the defeat of France: "Only a miracle can now save France, and I believe in miracles."

Muslim nation should be knit together into a strong unity and develop a central organisation of their own working in obedience to a central leadership. As a matter of fact this is a nationalist programme. Any nation, desiring to become powerful, great and strong, will adopt these methods to secure such ends, be it the Hindu nation or the Sikhs, the Germans or the Italians. A leader who is devoted to his nation, who is an adept at varying his plans and strategy to suit the needs of the moment and who is so gifted by nature to have his orders carried out is always fit to lead a nation on the path of ambition, whether he is a Moonje or a Savarkar, a Hitler or a Mussolini. And hundreds and thousands of young men who can move in an organised manner and do the bidding of their leader for their national ideals can always raise the standard of any nation, irrespective of the fact whether they believe in the Japanese or the Chinese ideals. Now, if Muslims are a nation by racial or historical ties and the end in view is merely to make this nation powerful and great, then the employment of these methods is no doubt necessary. Muslims will have to tread the path of national ambition so familiar to those who know the history of Western nationalism and, as a result thereof, we can secure a national government of our own or at least secure a reasonable share in the government of our country. But let us be clear in our minds, that this is not even the first step on the road to Islamic revolution or the creation of an Islamic state; it is in fact a reverse process which will lead us backward.

The community which is at present known by the name of Muslim is a hybrid mixture of all sorts of people with hardly a common standard of behaviour. From the point of view of moral conduct, you will find among Muslims as many varieties of character as are to be found among the non-believers. The proportion of those who are prepared to give false evidence in law-courts is probably as large among Muslims as among non-Muslim communities. Muslims are not a whit behind any other people in bribery, burglary, adultery, lying, and the other moral evils. All the methods which are used by non-Muslims for earning their

bread and acquiring wealth are also resorted to by the members of the Muslim community. A Muslim pleader, when he advocates the cause of his clients, knowing full well that the tatter's case is unjust, is as much devoid of the fear of God as a non-Muslim pleader. A Muslim aristocrat, when he comes across wealth, and a Muslim official, when he holds office, behaves exactly as a non-believer would do. To weld such elements into an organised unity and teach them by political training the duplicity and cleverness of a fox or by military training impart in them the bestial vigour of a wolf, may succeed in securing for them the kingdom of the jungle; but I cannot imagine how the Kingdom of God can come through such people and by such methods. Who will acknowledge their moral superiority? Who will regard them with feeling of respect and reverence? Whose heart will be attracted to Islam on coming into contact with such people? With such an uninspiring leadership, can they hope to repeat the historical performance alluded to in the Qur'anic words:

وَرَأَيْتَ النَّاسَ يَدْخُلُونَ فِي دِينِ اللَّهِ أَفْوَاجًا

"and you see people entering God's religion in multitudes."

(Al-Nasr 110:2)

Where on this broad surface of the earth will their spiritual leadership be recognised? In which part of the globe will the oppressed people welcome them as liberators? The task of "exalting the Word of God" requires a group of workers who are fearful of God and implicitly follow the law of God without consideration of gain or loss, no matter where they come from, whether from this community which is now called Muslim or from outside. A handful of such men are more valuable for this purpose than the huge crowd of which I have just spoken. Islam does not stand in need of a treasure of copper coins which passes for gold mohurs. Before examining the stamp on the coins, Islam needs to find out whether or not pure gold lies beneath. One such coin is more

valuable to Islam than a whole heap of spurious gold coins. Then, again, the leadership which God requires for the glory of His name is the type of leadership which should not budge an inch from the principles which Islam seeks to uphold, no matter what the outcome may be, whether all the Muslims perish by hunger or go down before the sword. Leadership which seeks only the advantage of its own community and without adherence to principles is prepared to adopt any plan with which it can secure the worldly salvation of its flock: leadership which is devoid of the fear of God is utterly unfit for the ideal which Islam has fixed for its followers. Then, again, the system of education and training which is based on the well-known maxim that one should move with times can never serve a religion of which final and irrevocable command is that whichever way the wind may blow and whatever path the world may follow, you must at any cost traverse the path which has been marked out for you by God. I assure you that, even if you are presented as a free gift a particular place of territory to rule over, you will not be able, as things go now, to administer it according to Islamic principles even for a single day. You have made no preparations to train or educate people imbued with the moral spirit and possessing the intellectual attitude which is necessary for running an Islamic state, its police, law-courts, army, revenue, and enforcing its financial, educational and foreign policy. The education which is imparted in your colleges and universities can doubtless produce, for an un-Islamic government, the type of men who can serve as secretaries and ministers; but I hope you will not be offended if I say that it cannot produce even peons for the Islamic courts, nor constables for the Islamic police. And this defect is confined not only to your present educational system. Our own old system of education which does not believe in the motion of the earth is equally useless from this point of view and cannot give to the Islamic state a single qazi, finance ministers or director of education. And with such utter lack of preparation to think of the formation of an Islamic state is pure moonshine. Those who talk in this strain are completely

ignorant of the true conception of an Islamic state.

Some people, however, argue that once a national state of Muslims is set up, may be of a non-Islamic character, it could be changed gradually into an Islamic state by education, training and moral reformation. But whatever little I have studied of history, politics and sociology, compels me to repudiate this theory as untenable. If such a plan succeeds I shall regard it as a miracle. As I have explained already, the form of organisation of a state has deep roots in social life. Until there is a change in the social fabric, no permanent change can be produced by artificial means in any system of government. A powerful ruler like the Omayyad `Umar, the son of `Abdul `Aziz, who had at his back a party of men trained by the Companions of the Prophet of Islam, completely failed in his efforts to transform the Omayyad state, because society as a whole was not prepared for reformation. Powerful potentates like Muhammad Tughlaq and Aurangzeb `Alamgir, in spite of their individual piety, could not effect any change in the system of government. Even a strong monarch like Mamoon-ul-Rasheed, who wanted to make only a superficial change in the form of government, was wholly unsuccessful. And this happened in a period when the power and strength of an individual could accomplish a good deal. I am, therefore, unable to understand how a national state, formed on a democratic basis can easily go through the process of such a basic transformation. In a democratic state, power is wielded by persons who have the approval of the voters. If the voters do not possess the true Islamic mentality and the moral attitude which Islam inculcates; if they are not able to tolerate the Islamic standards of integrity and moral purity, and if they are not prepared to accept the impartial justice and firm principles on, the basis of which an Islamic state is run, then their votes can never return the true type of Muslims to a parliament or assembly. Under these circumstances, power will come into the hands of those individuals only who, though they may be registered as

Muslims in the census, are far removed from Islam and their ideas and modes of behaviour. The wielding of power by such people means no more than this: that we shall stand where we are under a non-Muslim government. We may even occupy position worse than that, because a national state bearing the label of Islam will be bolder and more fearless than a non-Muslim state in suppressing an Islamic Revolution. Such a Muslim national state will pass a sentence of death and outlawry for acts which a non-Muslim state will punish only with imprisonment and all the same the leaders of this state will be called "ghazis" during their life time and saints after their death, because they happen to be Muslims by birth. Hence it is utterly wrong to think that this type of national state can in any sense be helpful in bringing about the Islamic Revolution. The question which confronts us is that if we have to revolutionise the social life of humanity, even of a Muslim national state, and if we have to do this without the aid of the state, more probably in the face of active opposition by the so-called Muslim state, why should we wait for that opposition to take shape instead of starting forthwith on the road of revolution? Why should we foolishly waste our time in expediting the so-called Muslim national state and fritter away our energies in setting it up? We know that it will not only be useless for our purpose but will rather prove an obstacle in our path.

The Technique of Islamic Movement

Gentlemen! I shall now explain to you in a brief historical survey the way in which the foundation of social life have to be changed and reconstructed in order to bring about an Islamic Revolution and the special technique by which this goal can be reached. In reality Islam is a movement which seeks to build up the structure of human society on the conception of Divine sovereignty. The movement has followed the same familiar pattern from the dawn of history. Its leaders were persons who are called the prophets of God. If we desire to start this movement it is inevitable to follow the practice and methods adopted

by those leaders, for there is no other technique suitable to the nature of this movement nor can one be devised. But when we attempt to trace the footsteps of these messengers of God we are faced with a great difficulty. We have the most meagre information about the work done and methods followed by the prophets of God in the early period of history. The Qur'an, no doubt, contains brief hints about their work but they do not give us a full picture. We also come across in the New Testament some sayings of Jesus Christ (Peace be upon him) which, though lacking authority, do throw some light on how the Islamic movement is conducted in its initial stages and what are the problems that it has to face. But Jesus Christ (peace be upon him) did not himself pass through the later stages of the movement so that we cannot find any guidance from his life about the later and final stages of the Islamic movement. In this matter we get clear and perfect guidance only in the life of Muhammad (peace be upon him). In seeking guidance from this source we are not influenced by mere sentimental attachment but surely because there is no other source available to us for a knowledge of the different phases through which the Islamic movement has to pass. In the whole history of leaders of the Islamic movement, it is Mohammed (peace be upon him) alone whose life furnishes us all the details of the various phases and aspects of the movement, from its early beginnings as an apostolic message of truth, down to its visible embodiment in an external state system with a definite constitution, a clear-cut internal and external policy and a precise social organisation. Hence I shall place before you from this source a brief description of the technique of this movement. You are well aware that when Mohammed, the Messenger of God (peace be upon him) was called upon to deliver the message of Islam, a great many moral, cultural, economic, and political problems were awaiting solution. There were already in existence two rival imperialisms, the Roman and the Persian. The social life of Arabia and the surrounding countries rested on a basis of class distinctions, and class conflicts were by no means infrequent. Economic exploitation

was widespread, and moral evils existed in full measure. In his own country there were intricate problems awaiting solution by a leader. The whole nation was steeped in ignorance, moral degradation, economic chaos, and internecine quarrels. The coastal parts of Arabia, right up to Yemen, and including the fertile provinces of Iraq, were in the grip of Persian imperialism. In the north, Roman domination had extended itself up to the frontiers of Hejaz. In Hejaz itself Jewish capitalists had established great centres of trade and had enmeshed the Arabs in the net of their usurious transactions. Facing the easternmost coast was the Christian Abyssinian government which had invaded Mecca only a few years before. In Nijran, lying between Hejaz and Yemen, there was firmly entrenched a group of Christians who derived support from the Christian government and had economic and political relations with it. In spite of all these multifarious problems which needed urgent solution, the Prophet of God paid no attention to these problems of the world outside or to those which were more intimately related to his own people. On the other hand, he merely called upon his countrymen to give up all gods except one God and to render full obedience to Him only.

This was not because the Prophet of Islam held those problems to be unimportant or regarded them as unworthy of serious attention. You are well aware of the fact that at a later stage he did give attention to all these problems and solved them one by one. But the reason why he turned away his attention from these pressing questions of the day and concentrated all his energy on preaching obedience to God was that, from the standpoint of the Islamic movement, all evils which arise in the social life of mankind owe their existence to this basic misconception that man regards himself as an independent and irresponsible being; in other words, he sets himself up as his own god and the word, because he falls into the error of taking someone else besides his Creator as his guide and law-giver, whether this may be a human being or some inanimate object of nature. So long as this evil persists at the root, no amount of Islamic theory can succeed in

eradicating social diseases. Unless this basic misconception is corrected and man becomes conscious of his responsibility to his Creator, an evil suppressed at one point will reappear at another point in some other form. Hence if man is to be reformed and human society is to be purged of evils, the mind of man should first of all be disabused of the idea of independence and mankind should realise that the universe in which we live is not in reality a kingdom without a sovereign. On the other hand, it is governed by an All-Powerful Sovereign, whose sovereignty neither stands in need of man's acceptance, nor can it be extinguished by his efforts, nor again can human beings step out of the limits of this kingdom and find refuge elsewhere. In view of this hard fact and stark reality, the notion that man is an independent being, free to follow his own desires and dictates of his reason, is a foolish presumption not supported by facts and of which the evil consequences will but recoil on his own head. Both wisdom and realism demand that man should bow down his head before his Maker straightforwardly and without any reservation, and admit in all humility that his position is that of an obedient servant in relation to his Maker, Who is his Master, Guide and Law-Giver. It should also be brought home to man that in the whole of this universe there is only one Sovereign, Master and Ruler. No one else is entitled here to issue his own commands nor do's, in paint of fact, any one else's writ run here. Therefore, one should not agree to become the instrument of any one's will other than His Will, nor accept the command of any other nor bow down before any one else. There is no one worthy to be styled in this world as His Majesty, because all majesty resides in Him. There is no one here who can be called His Holiness, because all holiness is vested in Him. There is no being to be styled as His Highness because highness is the sole attribute of God. There is no one here to be called His Lordship because lordship belongs to God wholly and solely. There is no legislator here and no law-giver, for the only law deserving obedience is the Law of God. There 'is no one here besides Him, who can rightfully claim to control and regulate

the affairs of humanity, none who can administer justice in his own right, none who can answer the prayers of man and from whom man can expect help or succor in distress; there is none besides Him, Who possesses the keys of authority and there is nobody else who can claim absolute and unconditional allegiance of human beings. All men are but servants and there is only one Master. Hence it behooves us to deny obedience to all authority which does not itself owe allegiance to Him and to refuse to serve any person or group of persons who act independently of the Will and Purpose of the Creator. This is the bedrock basis of all reformation. On this foundation alone the whole superstructure of individual character and social organisation can be planned anew after pulling down the old structure, and all the problems of human life that have arisen in the past or will arise in future can be solved in a new manner.

Without any previous preparation or anything by way of preliminary action, the Prophet Muhammad peace be upon him) directly presented this fundamental conception to his people. He did not follow any round-about method in preaching his message. For instance, he felt no need to prepare the ground by trying to win the popularity and gain the affection of his people through useful social and humanitarian work. Nor did he seek political power in order to push forward his mission through the back door of Government authority. He did nothing of the kind. What we see, on the other hand, is that there came forward a man who directly announced that "There is no god but One God". He did not fix his eyes on anything else. It would be wrong to conclude that mere prophetic boldness or missionary zeal was responsible for this direct and straightforward mode of preaching. In reality this is the necessary technique of the Islamic movement. The influence and prestige gained by any other means is of no use whatever for the moral reform which Islam undertakes..People who co-operate with you on any basis other than that of "no god except One God" can give you no help in the task of social reconstruction on Islamic lines. In

this great work only those persons can be for real use who respond to you on hearing the cry of "no god. except One Gad", who are attracted solely by this truth and who desire to make it the foundation-stone of their lives and prepare themselves for work on this basis. Therefore, the particular type of wisdom and practical understanding which is necessary for conducting the Islamic movement requires that, without any introductory work, a start should be made directly with this call to the unity of God.

This conception of the unity of God is not a mere religious creed. As I have explained just now, the whole system of social life which is based on the conception that man is an independent being or that sovereignty belongs to any other animate being, is uprooted from its foundation and a new superstructure rises on a different basis with belief in the Oneness and Sovereignty of God. Today the whole world hears your Mu'adhdhin (caller to prayers) proclaiming loudly, "I bear witness that there is no god except One God" and hardly takes any notice of it because neither the caller knows what he is calling for, nor do the hearers find any real meaning or purpose in it. But were it to become known that the proclamation is intended to mean-and the caller is fully conscious of this meaning-that one should recognise no sovereign nor accept any government, nor yet obey any law, or that one should refuse to accept the jurisdiction of any court, to carry out the command of any one or bind himself to any established usage or rite and that one should repudiate the privileges, sovereignty, sanctity and authority of everyone else besides God, and declare himself to be a rebel against un-Godly rulers, you can very well understand that this daily proclamation will not be tolerated even for a moment. Whether you wish to pick up a quarrel with any one or not, the whole world will come and quarrel with you. As soon as you raise the cry 'you feel as if all of a sudden the earth and the heavens had turned into enemies and on all sides you will find yourselves encircled by hostile elements. This very state of affairs confronted Muhammad (peace be upon him) when he

raised this cry. The Announcer had raised the cry in full consciousness of its import and the audience knew very well what he was really driving at.- Hence everyone who was adversely affected in any respect by this cry stood up to suppress it. The priests scented danger in this cry to their papal domination, the rich saw a menace to their hoarded wealth and luxurious living, the capitalist realised the danger to his economic overlordship; the worshippers of race and tribe were not slow to feel the challenge it implied to their superiority; the nationalists at once shrugged their shoulders at this new unifying force which meant the destruction of the artificial unity built on the idea of nationality, and the ancestor worshippers rose in indignation at this looming bit of a cloud whose showers were to wash away their ancestral ways of living. In short, everyone who had set up an idol for his worship felt the ground slipping from under his feet and all these people hastily patched up a unity among themselves, in spite of their deep-seated differences to fight this new and formidable menace to their established way of living. Under these circumstances only those persons came forward to join Muhammad (peace be upon him) whose minds were clear, who were capable of the understanding and accepting the truth and who had at least such love for it left in them that when they realised that his call was a call to truth, they girded up their loins to face death and destruction for its sake. The movement needed people of this very type. They came one by one and in twos and fours. Their numbers increased gradually as the struggle developed. Some of them had to lose their employment; some were driven out of their homes by their own kith and kin: some had to leave their friends, relatives and acquaintances; a large number of them were dragged on hot sand; while others were stoned and abused in the market-place. Someone had his eyes taken out and another his head broken. Attempts were made to buy off people by offering them women, wealth, office, authority and everything else that could be offered. All these things came, and it was necessary that

they should. come, for without them the Islamic movement could neither gain strength nor grow to wide proportions.

The first advantage of all this was that people of weak character and irresolute determination could not join this select band. Whoever came was the cream of the society then existing and was really needed. There was no method of selection more effective than this; that whoever came to this movement should pass through these trials. The morally unfit were automatically weeded out.

Then again, those who came were undergo these hardships not for any selfish motives, not the interest of their family, tribe or nation but the salve-of what they felt to be a great truth and order to seek the pleasure of their Lord. For this alone they were beaten, starved to death, and became victims of an unparalleled oppression; with the result that they developed the true Islamic attitude which was needed. The struggle moulded their character and gave added sincerity to their beliefs and actions. It was natural that in this automatic process of training they should become permeated with the true spirit of Islam. When a person comes forward with a high ideal and undergoes sufferings, tortures, exile, poverty and other hardships for its sake, the spirit of that ideal penetrates his heart and fills his mind, and his whole individuality is transformed into the likeness of his ideal and purpose. In order to complete and hasten this transformation, prayers were prescribed for the followers of the new movement so that their minds may become concentrated on this one aim, the sole object of their life. By repeatedly proclaiming the sovereignty of Him Whom they regarded as Sovereign, their convictions would gain in depth and intensity and they should fully believe in the omniscience of God, in His mastery of the Day of Judgment and His complete supremacy over all His creatures, because henceforth they were to work under His commands. This was also necessary so that the idea of obedience to any one except Him should never again be allowed to influence their minds

even in the slightest degree. While on the one side, those who joined the Islamic movement were going through this process of training, on the other this struggle itself gave a fillip to the movement. When people witnessed with their eyes that hell had been let loose on the devoted followers of the Prophet, they were beaten, imprisoned and turned out of their homes, they naturally desired to know what all this anguish was about. And when they learnt that these people were being tortured not for "women, wealth, or property", but only because they had come into possession of a new Truth to which they held fast sincerely and that their lives and habits bore no trace of any selfish motive, they were naturally led to seek that for which those people were cheerfully facing all this tribulations and calamities. And when they came to know about this was nothing else except belief in on God, that this belief had effected such a revolution in their lives that they were ready to throw away all the advantages which society offered them and willingly gave away all prospects of worldly success for the sake of truth and righteousness, and that in the cause which they had taken up they were not slow to sacrifice their lives, property and even their family, a new light dawned upon them sweepingly away before it shadows of doubt and mis-understanding. In this background of righteous suffering they were irresistibly drawn to the bosom of truth. This was the reason why, barring those persons who were blinded by religious prejudice or vested interests, the rest were all drawn towards this movement. Some attracted almost instantaneously while others resisted the attraction for a while. But sooner or later every truth-loving and selfless man joined the movement.

Meanwhile the leader of the movement, by his personal example, fully demonstrated the principle of his movement and everything that the movement stood for. Every act, speech and movement of the leader breathed the true spirit of the Islamic faith and fully brought out its implications in practical life. This is a question requiring detailed

discussion for which there is no space here but I will briefly mention a few important things.

His wife Khadijah was the wealthiest woman in Hejaz and he was carrying on trade with her capital. When the Prophet became active in his new mission, his commercial business came on a standstill, for by devoting himself completely to his mission and incurring the enmity of his people, the business suffered until it collapsed. Whatever the couple had laid by was invested and exhausted in a few years' time in propagating the new Faith. Ultimately matters came to such a pass that when the Messenger of God went to Ta'if on his mission of preaching religion, he who had once been the prince of merchants had hardly means enough to buy a donkey to carry him to his destination.

The Quraishites offered him the throne of Hejaz and said that they would accept him as their king. They offered to give him in marriage the prettiest woman of Arabia and to place at his disposal as much wealth as he liked on condition that he gave up his mission. But the man who had stood up for the salvation of mankind, rejected all these offers and remained content with the abuses, vilifications, and cruelties of his countrymen. The leaders of the Quraish and other Arabs said, 'O Muhammad! how can we come and sit with you and hear your talk when in your company there are always to be found slaves, poverty-stricken and mean persons? You have collected around you all those who are regarded in our society as low class people. Remove them and we shall seek your company'. But the man who had come to level up the high and the low, refused to remove the poor for the sake of the rich.

During the whole course of the movement, the Prophet of God never cared for the interests of his own country, tribe, nation or family. It was this disinterestedness which convinced the world that the Prophet was working for the betterment of all human beings irrespective of race or nationality and it was this which attracted people of all nations towards his movement. If he had cared for his own family, then non-

Hashimites would have had no interest at all in his movement. Had he been anxious to preserve, somehow or other, the authority of the Quraishites, the non-Quraishites would have had no incentive to take part in this work. Had he stood for the superiority of the Arab race, then Bilal of Abyssinia, Suhaib of Rome and Salman of Persia would have had no reason to support him in his task. What really attracted everyone was his pure and sincere Godliness and his absolute selflessness free from all personal, family, tribal, and nationalistic motives.

When he was compelled to leave Mecca, all the money and valuables which his enemies had deposited with him for safe custody were handed over by him to all with instructions that after he had gone, they should be returned to their rightful owners. A worldly man would have every motive on such an occasion to run away with whatever he could lay his hand on, but the servant of God returned the property belonging to his blood-thirsty enemies and this at a time when they had already decided to murder him. This unexampled moral behaviour must have caused no lithe astonishment to the people of Mecca, and I am sure that, when two years later, they came out to fight against the Messenger of God on the battlefield of Badr, they must have felt in their hearts that they were fighting a man who had not betrayed their trust and who was mindful of their rights even when he knew - that they had plotted against his life and were intent on his destruction. While they drew out their swords against him in blind hatred and obduracy, their hearts must have been feeling the pangs of conscience. It is quite possible that this may have been one of the moral cause that led to the defeat of the non-believers in the Battle of Badr.

After a long and bitter struggle extending over thirteen years, when the time came for a small Islamic state he set up in Medina, -there were already available 200 workers every one of whom had received full training in Islam and was thereby enabled to perform any task he was called upon to undertake in the capacity of a Muslim. These people

were all now ready to conduct the Islamic state which was then set up. For full ten years the Messenger of God himself guided the affairs of this state, and in this short space of time trained thousands of men to perfection in running every department of government in the Islamic manner. This was the period in which Islamic ideology developed from an abstract idea into a perfect socio-political system and every aspect of the administrative, educational, judicial, economic, cultural, financial, military, and international policy of Islam was fully clarified. For every sphere of life, principles were laid down and applied to practical conditions of life. Workers on these lines were prepared by education, training, and practical experience, and these people presented such an example of Islamic government that within a brief span of eight years the small state of the town of Medina expanded into an Islamic state covering the whole of Arabia. As people saw Islam in its practical form and witnessed its concrete results, they were convinced that this was humanity at its best and that the true salvation of mankind lay in this form of society only. The worst enemies had ultimately to come over to the cause against which they had fought for years together. Khalid, son of Waleed, accepted it; 'Ikrima, son of Abu Jahl bowed to it as well as Abu Sufyan, Wahshee (the barbarian), the murderer of Hamza also embraced the new faith and even Hindah who had swallowed the liver of 'the Prophet's uncle walked into the camp of the Prophet whom she had at one time hated so fiercely.

The historians have given as much prominence to the religious wars of the Prophet that people were misled into believing that this revolution in Arabia was brought about by violence and bloodshed,, whereas not more than a thousand or twelve hundred men were killed on both sides in the course of all the wars fought during the five years in which the warlike Arab nation was subdued. If you recall to mind the history of revolutions in the world, you shall have to admit that this revolution is fit to be called a "bloodless revolution". And this

revolution changed not merely the administration of the country but also the mental and moral outlook of the people. The whole of Arabia was transformed as if by a magic touch, in its mode of living, in its moral habits and spiritual values, in short, in all aspects of its life. It was not a mere political and social reform that had taken place. The whole basis of material and moral life had undergone a revolution. Adulterers whose life had been one of insensate self-indulgence were now protectors of female chastity and erstwhile drunkards became leaders of the prohibition movement. Men who had lived as thieves and vagabonds came to have such a keen sense of honesty that they hesitated even to accept food from their friends, because it smacked of taking hold of another's property, so much so that God Himself had to assure them in the Qur'an that there was no harm in taking such food. Those who had been robbers and dacoits became so religious that when an ordinary soldier among them, at the time of the conquest of the Persian capital, came upon the royal Persian crown worth crores of rupees, he concealed it in his tattered blanket and in the dark hours of the night handed it over to his general so that his honesty may not become an object of public admiration and hypocrisy may not taint his sincerity. Those who had no respect for human life at all and with whom it was quite common to bury their daughters alive with their own hands, came to have such regard for the sanctity of life that they could not see even a fowl being killed mercilessly. Those who had no idea whatever of truthfulness and justice became so truthful and just that on the occasion of the peace of Khyber, when their revenue collector went to collect the government tax from the Jews and the latter offered him a large sum of money in order to persuade him to reduce the government demand, he refused to accept the bribe and distributed one-half of the produce between the government and the Jews by laying two separate stacks side by side and asking the Jews freely to choose one of them. At this strange behaviour of the revenue collector, the Jews were taken aback completely and voluntarily cried: "This is the justice

on which the earth and heavens stand". Among them arose governors who did not live in "Government Houses" but among their subjects in houses like theirs, who freely went about the streets on foot; who had no guards at their doors and were accessible to everyone at any time of day and night. Among them were to be found judges one of whom dismissed the suit of the Caliph himself against a Jew on the ground that the Caliph could not produce any other witness except his son and slave. Among them appeared military generals one of whom, on being forced to evacuate, a city during a battle, returned the whole of the Jizya (protective tax) to the non-believers on the ground that he was not in a position to afford protection to the conquered and, therefore, had no right to retain the tax which had been collected in lieu of such protection. Among them were born ambassadors one of whom in a court full of the Persian generals gave such practical demonstration of the principle of human equality in Islam, and directed such relevant criticism against the class distinctions in Persia, that God alone knows those many Persian soldiers must have been overwhelmed by a feeling of respect for this religion of humanity. Citizens arose among them who had such a strong sense of moral responsibility that they usually came forward of their own accord to confess the crimes which were punishable by amputation and demanded that they should be purged of the evil effects of their crimes by punishment in this world, so that they may not have to appear before God in the position of a thief or an adulterer. Soldiers were to be found among them who did not fight out of mercenary motives but for the sake of the faith in which they believed. They marched to battlefields at their own expense and whatever booty came into their hands they placed whole of it before their general. Could such complete transformation in the moral and mental attitude of a whole people be brought about merely by wars or physical force? The broad canvas of history lies before you. Can you bring up any instance where the sword has revolutionised human morality so completely?

It seems strange that while during the space of thirteen years only three hundred persons embraced Islam, in the latter ten years the whole country of Arabia adopted this religion wholesale. As some people cannot solve this enigma, they give all sorts of strange reasons for it. But the matter is quite plain. So long as life had not been actually planned and organised on the basis of this new ideology, people could not understand what this novel type of leader wanted to do. All sorts of doubts arose in their minds. Some said that he was indulging in poetic fantasies; others that he had lost his wits. Still others thought that he was a visionary, and each one thus gave his own view of the matter. Only men of unusually keen understanding and intelligence could believe in Muhammad (peace be upon him) at that stage -men whose realistic vision could see clearly that the salvation of mankind lay in this new creed. But when a complete system of life was built up on this ideology and people had actual experience of it, when they saw before them its concrete result, it was that they understood what it was for which this virtuous servant of God had faced all the perils and toils of life. After this no room was left for doubt, obstinacy or prejudice. For any one who had eyes in his head and light in those eyes it became impossible to deny this clear reality.

Gentlemen! this is the method by which Islam seeks to bring about a social revolution. And this is, its way of doing the job. It begins with a simple call to the obedience of God and an invitation to people to abandon the life of self-indulgence and accept the restraints of morality. Then it gradually moves forward. People think that this is a kind of miracle and say that this cannot appear again. Only a messenger of God should come and perform it. But the study of history convinces us that it is a perfectly natural occurrence. There is to be found in it the logical and scientific relationship of cause and effect. If we work in this manner today the same results will appear. It is, of course, true that for this work, qualities of faith, a true understanding of Islam, single-mindedness of purpose, strong power of judgment and complete

sacrifice of personal feelings and selfish desires are necessary, person of strong will are needed for this purpose who on accepting truth, can concentrate on it and will not look towards anything else. Whatever may happen in the world they would not budge an inch from the path chalked out for them by the Quran. They would be prepared to sacrifice all prospects of personal advancement in worldly life. They should not hesitate to disappoint their own and their parents' hopes and expectations. They should not feel aggrieved over the separation of friends and relatives. Society, government, law, nation, country, whatever obstructs the achievement of their object, they should be prepared to struggle against it. This type of men upheld and exalted the Word of God in an age bygone and it is only such persons that can repeat and accomplish the task again.

I now close this subject with a few concluding remarks. Providence has made Aligarh the nerve-centre of Indian Muslims. It is on this account that four or five years back I had selected Aligarh for an address and placed before it a new plan of educational system which, in my opinion, was essential for the revival and regeneration of Islam. With similar feelings I am again addressing the students of Aligarh and placing before them the plan of that movement which is the only possible means of bringing about a social revolution of an Islamic character. I have done my duty and communicated to you whatever I had in my mind. The responsibility of changing your hearts does not lie with me.



Need for a Righteous Party

CURRENTLY, THE PROCESS of demolition is well underway in the world. We do not know أَشَرُّ أُرِيدَ بِعَن فِي الْأَرْضِ أَمْ أَرَادَ يَوْمَ رَبُّهُمْ رَشَدًا (whether evil is intended for those on the earth, or whether their Lord intends to direct them to the Right Way. Al-Jinn:10). However, the signs do tell that the lifespan of the standard-bearers of the culture which has been the dominant in the world up until now is coming to its end, that the time-period of their test will be soon over and as per the way of God, the time has now come that these people and their unIslamic culture be unseated from power and leadership. They got whatever opportunities they had to run the world. They have displayed all their attributes and hidden talents to the world. There is probably nothing in them now which hasn't come out into the open. Therefore, the likelihood is that very soon they will get knocked out from the arena. And all this great defeat and breakdown is happening so that they could perform their own funeral service by themselves. After this, there is also a possibility that a yet another era of darkness may reign the world just as it happened in the time-period between the decline of the last Islamic Movement and the birth of the current unIslamic culture. And it is also possible that a new form of construction may emerge from this ongoing demolition.

The forces of capitalistic democracy, national socialism and communism are clashing with each other. These are not separate cultures that there should be any question of choosing one over the other and the question of the survival of the fittest. In reality, they are three branches of the same culture. All three are formed on one and the

same concepts of universe and man, ideology and moral foundation. To regard man as an animal, to suppose the world to be without God, to derive laws for human life from natural sciences and to base morality on experiment and interests, all these are the common foundations of these ideologies. The only difference between them is that the unislamic culture first sowed the seed of individual liberty and individuality of nations which gave birth to nation-state and capitalistic democracy which continued to destroy mankind for a long time. Then when mankind's suffering and pain under its oppressive regime reached its limit, this culture presented communist revolution as the cure to this problem. However, it became clear quite quickly that this treatment proved to be more destructive than the disease. Finally, this culture proposed another cure in the form of fascism or national socialism which proved within few years that this final child of this mother of all evils surpassed her first two children in evil and wickedness.

Now the world cannot be given any more chances to experiment with this culture, a culture which regards man an animal, starts its work by assuming this animal to be unbridled and produces all those sicknesses in him – from insatiable hunger to the worst kind of beastliness – which is extremely fatal to humanness. Actually, this culture with all its branches has come to the last stage of its natural life. Its period of examination has come to an end, it has run out of its charms which it could present to the world as a solution to the human problems. And even if supposedly it creates an excuse for the creation of yet another “ism” to extend its lifespan, then God's will doesn't seem to allow it have any more chances to fill His earth with tumult and disorder. It is very much possible that one of its branches may survive this clash but even so it would be only temporary. Soon that branch will crack and spit fire only to be engulfed in its own flames and turned to ashes.

Now as to the question of whether any other era of darkness would descend upon the world after the destruction of this culture or a new dawn of construction would begin, then the answer to this

question depends on two things:

One, after the failure of the pure Jahiliyyah (unIslamic beliefs and practices), there isn't any other ideology or at least not found which is better than the previous corrupt ideologies, an ideology from which the human intellect could expect anything good and upon which a powerful and vigorous culture could be built.

Two, there isn't any group or party in the world possessing the qualities of Jihad (fighting spirit) and Ijtihad (creativity) which are required to build the palace of a new culture on a new ideology and whose morals and attributes are different from those people with whose filthiness and wickedness the world had close encounters.

If such an ideology were to emerge on time and if such a righteous party were to rise up for it then certainly mankind can be saved from another era of darkness otherwise no power could stop it from falling into this dark abyss. The great shock which mankind is going through now, this wolf-like ferocity with which man is treating man, this cruelty and hard-heartedness which isn't demonstrated by man even during the times of fear and terror, this lack of compassion and indifference which even a beastly animal is incapable of showing, this knowledge and wisdom whose consequences are being witnessed today in the form of jets capable of setting the world on fire and tanks capable of blowing people to pieces, these fruits of organisational skills which ripened in the form of plundering armies, this end result of industrial development emerging in the horrifying form of tools of war, this miracle of press and media which is being used for propaganda and creating hatred between nations, all these things are enough for breaking man's heart and turning him pessimistic towards himself and all his abilities and talents. The natural consequence of which could only be that mankind falls into a state of centuries long sleep and unconsciousness out of despair.

As has been mentioned above, if there is anything that could

save mankind from this painful end it is the emergence of a righteous ideology and a party working untiringly for it.

But what could be that ideology which has any chance of success today?

There is no chance for paganism, upon which many ancient cultures were founded, to be brought back to life. Paganism is baseless now. Even though the ignorant people might still be under its spell, rational and knowledgeable people would never fall prey to the superstition that the universe is being run by many gods and that mankind's success and happiness is connected with deities and spirits. Besides, it's a fact that complex problems of human life are not solved by pagan concepts rather they are made more complicated. The biggest problem faced by the world today is the lack of unity in humankind. But paganism does not solve this problem rather it creates more reasons for further divisions instead of creating unity. Therefore, there is no possibility for paganism to come to power in today's world.

Monasticism – another kind of ignorance and unIslamic practice – never was nor will be a force. Karma, Ahimsa (non-violence) transmigration of the soul and pantheism which freeze the soul, depress courage, deprive energy and intoxicate the faculties of thinking with its opium of imaginations, do not have vitality in them to give rise to a culture capable of taking the administration of the land in hands and assume the venerable office of leading the world. No matter how much any Samiri tries hard to bring this dead body back to life, these concepts can never go beyond the stage of Dhyan (meditation), Tyag (world-renunciation) and Tapasya (celibacy) and create a righteous civilisation, form a just government and build an enlightened culture. So, dead and declining nations might get entangled in these concepts but a living and emerging nation can never get drawn to them.

As for the pure Jahiliyyah, the world has now learned so much of experiencing it and its products that soon it is going to get disappointed with it. Whatever results the ideas like a man considering himself to

be an animal, adopting the theory of evolution, struggle for existence, natural selection and survival of the fittest, making material benefits and pleasures the goal in life, regarding experiments and interests to be the sources of morality and not accepting any sovereignty above human, all these results have now come to the fore with all their bitterness. Due to these concepts what man got was racial and national bigotry, claims to racial superiority, political and economic rivalries between nation-states, the chaos and disorder of imperial and colonial plundering, freedom of individuals, nations and empires from any moral checks and balances and the biggest of them all: man acting like an actual animal and treating other human beings like animals, rather like soul-less machines. If all these concepts create any kind of democracy then it is the type in which man has the freedom to oppress, make money in unlawful ways and be shameless and promiscuous. And if they create communism or socialism then it is the type in which masses are handled like herds of sheep by a dictator or a small party so that it can take them wherever it wants and make of them whatever it wants. These fruits, which are produced by these concepts, are not the consequence of any coincidentally mistake rather this is exactly the natural demand of this evil tree that such fruits be produced by it. Therefore, just as man has not been able to achieve success of any kind with it till now, similarly it cannot be expected in the future too that this animalistic concept of humanity, materialistic ideology of the universe and experimental and expediency-based notions of morality could create a social philosophy and way of life which could lead man to success.

After the failure of all these ideologies, if the world could have any expectations of success from any ideology then it could be only:

Which regards man a human and not an animal.

Which corrects man's opinion about himself.

Whose concept of humanity is above western science's understanding of

man being an "animal", Christianity's "original sin" and Hinduism's "transmigration of souls."

Which does not turn man into the absolute authority and an unbridled horse. Rather it makes him submit to the sovereignty of the king of the universe and accountable to Him.

Which makes him abide by such practical moral code which does not give him the right to change it as per his whims and desires.

Which gives a moral and spiritual foundation upon which mankind can unite instead of drawing materialistic lines for creating divisions.

Which gives principles of social life capable of establishing justice between individuals, parties and nations.

Which gives man his goals in life that are above selfishness and standards of value judgement better than materialism.

And along with all these merits, not only helps man in his intellectual, academic and civilisation growth but also guides him, correctly leading him to his growth both materially and morally.

Is there any such ideology in the world except for Islam? Hence, it is totally right to say that now mankind's future depends on Islam. All man-made ideologies have failed. There is no chance for any one of them to be successful. And man now does not have any courage in him to create a new ideology and bet on it. In such a scenario, Islam is the only ideology and system from which man have expectations of success, which has the chance of becoming the religion of mankind and by following which the destruction of the world could be prevented.

However, it would not be right to draw conclusion from this point that the world is just ready to get conquered, that a little speech and the publication of small pamphlets on the merits of Islam would be enough to conquer Asia, Africa, Europe and the Americas. The fall of the culture doesn't happen in this sudden way that it was there yesterday and not anymore today. And another culture does not come

to predominance in such a sudden way either that today it is flat land and then tomorrow a majestic palace is built by some kind of a magical spell. The thoughts, principles and ways of a falling culture still hold sway over hearts and minds, arts and sciences and civilisation and society for years. Its effects do not get neutralised on their own rather they have to be neutralised. In the same way, the standard-bearers of the declining culture remain influential for years even after its fall. They do not go away on their own, they have to be kicked out. Therefore, building the structure of a new culture is not a game that you lay back on your couch and it will be constructed on its own. For this purpose, a powerfully critical and constructive movement is needed, which on the one hand uproots the old culture by the power of its knowledge and thought and on the other hand organises arts and sciences on its peculiar intellectual foundations from the scratch, until it dominates the psychology of the world in such a way that people begin to feel and think in that way. On one hand, it should reform the old moulds in which mankind used to be shaped and on the other hand it should form new moulds in which men of new morals and characters are shaped. On one hand, it should destroy by force old system of civilisation and politics and on the other hand, practically create an entire system of civilisation and politics on its principles.

So, in order to save the world from the danger of another era of darkness and gift it with the blessing of Islam, it is not enough to say that a right ideology is available. Along with that, there is a need for a righteous party as well. It requires people who truly believe in the ideology. The first thing they need to do is to provide the proof of their belief and the only way it can be done is that they themselves become the followers of the authority they have accepted, adhere to the code in which they believe, become models of the morality they regard to be right, abide by what they regard to be mandatory and avoid doing that which they think to be unlawful. Without this, their truthfulness will be doubtful let alone anyone submitting to them. Then, they have to be

rebels against this corrupt system of culture, civilisation and politics, sever their relationships with it and its followers, abandon all those benefits, pleasures, comforts and hopes associated with this system and gradually bear the losses, discomforts and hardships which are inevitable for rebelling against the dominant system. Then, they have to do all that which are necessary for ending the rule of a corrupt system and replacing it with the right one. In this struggle for revolution, they have to sacrifice their wealth, spend their precious time, utilise all the faculties of their body, mind and soul and face the dangers of imprisonment, exile, confiscation of assets and destruction of family and lay down their lives if the time comes. Without going through all this, neither has any revolution occurred nor can occur. Unless there is a party of true believers backing a right ideology, a mere ideology, no matter how superior it is, cannot spread its roots into the ground from the pages of a book. Just as the strength of the principles is important for the success of an ideology so is the strength of character, conduct, sacrifice and devotion of the people who believe in it. The correct practice of agriculture, the potential of the seeds and the favourability of the season are all important by themselves however, the land is so realistic that until and unless the farmer proves his right over it through his hard work, sweat and due diligence, the land refuses to yield crops.

Although sincerity of belief, sacrifice and devotion are essential for the establishment of any system of life, be it the true or false system, the true system asks for even more sincerity and sacrifice than the false system. Truth is such a scrupulous jeweller that it will not accept even the slightest impurity. It wants pure gold. Until all the impurity is burned by putting it through the furnace of trials and tribulations, and until its touchstone separates the pure gold from the alloy, it doesn't like to take the responsibility of selling it in the market under its name for it is truth not falsehood that it sells counterfeit coins and gilded Jewellery. It is because of this reason that the Quran repeatedly says:

مَا كَانَ اللَّهُ لِيَذَرَ الْمُؤْمِنِينَ عَلَى مَا أَنْتُمْ عَلَيْهِ حَتَّى يَمِيزَ الْخَبِيثَ مِنَ الطَّيِّبِ

Allah will not let the believers stay in the state they are: He will set the wicked apart from the good. (Aal-Imran 3: 179)

الَّذِينَ أَحْسَبَ النَّاسُ أَنْ يُتْرَكُوا أَنْ يَقُولُوا آمَنَّا وَهُمْ لَا يُفْتَنُونَ
وَلَقَدْ فَتَنَّا الَّذِينَ مِنْ قَبْلِهِمْ فَلَيَعْلَمَنَّ اللَّهُ الَّذِينَ صَدَقُوا
وَلَيَعْلَمَنَّ الْكَاذِبِينَ ۝ أَمْ حَسِبَ الَّذِينَ يَعْمَلُونَ السَّيِّئَاتِ أَنْ
يَسْبِقُونَا سَاءَ مَا يَحْكُمُونَ ۝

Alif. Lam. Mim. Do people think that they will be let go merely by saying: "We believe," and that they will not be tested, for We indeed tested those who went before them? Allah will most certainly ascertain those who spoke the truth and those who lied. Do the evil-doers suppose that they will get the better of Us? How evil is their judgement!

(Al-Ankaboot 29: 1-4)

أَمْ حَسِبْتُمْ أَنْ تُدْخَلُوا الْجَنَّةَ وَلَمَّا يَأْتِكُمْ مَثَلُ الَّذِينَ خَلَوْا مِنْ
قَبْلِكُمْ مَسَّتْهُمُ الْبَأْسَاءُ وَالضَّرَاءُ وَزُلُّوا حَتَّى يَقُولَ الرَّسُولُ
وَالَّذِينَ آمَنُوا مَعَهُ مَتَى نَصُرُ اللَّهُ أَلَا إِنَّ نَصْرَ اللَّهِ قَرِيبٌ ۝

Do you suppose that you will enter Paradise untouched by the suffering endured by the people of faith who passed away before you? They were afflicted by misery and hardship and were so convulsed that the Messenger and the believers with him cried out: "When will Allah's help arrive?" (Al-Baqarah 2: 214)

أَمْ حَسِبْتُمْ أَنْ تُتْرَكُوا وَلَمَّا يَعْلَمِ اللَّهُ الَّذِينَ جَاهَدُوا مِنْكُمْ وَلَمْ
يَتَّخِذُوا مِنْ دُونِ اللَّهِ وَلَا رَسُولِهِ وَلَا الْمُؤْمِنِينَ وَلِيجَةً وَاللَّهُ خَبِيرٌ
بِمَا تَعْمَلُونَ ۝

Do you imagine that you will be spared without being subjected to any test? Know well that Allah has not yet determined who strove hard (in His cause), and has not taken any others instead of His Messenger and

the believers as his trusted allies. Allah is well aware of all that you do.

(Al-Tawbah 9:16)

وَمِنَ النَّاسِ مَن يَقُولُ آمَنَّا بِاللَّهِ فَإِذَا أُوذِيَ فِي اللَّهِ جَعَلَ فِتْنَةَ النَّاسِ
كَعَذَابِ اللَّهِ وَلَئِن جَاء نَصْرٌ مِّن رَّبِّكَ لَيَقُولُنَّ إِنَّا كُنَّا مَعَكُمْ ۖ أَوَلَيْسَ
اللَّهُ بِأَعْلَمَ بِمَا فِي صُدُورِ الْعَالَمِينَ ۝ وَلَيَعْلَمَنَّ اللَّهُ الَّذِينَ آمَنُوا وَلَيَعْلَمَنَّ
الْمُنَافِقِينَ ۝

Among people there are some who say: "We believe in Allah." But when such a person is made to endure suffering in Allah's cause, he reckons the persecution he suffers at the hands of people as though it is a chastisement from Allah. But if victory comes from your Lord, the same person will say "We were with you." Does Allah not know whatever is in the hearts of the people of the world? And Allah will surely make evident those who believe, and He will surely make evident the hypocrites.

(Al-Ankaboot

29:10-11)

وَلَيَبْلُوَنَّكُمْ بِشَيْءٍ مِّنَ الْخَوْفِ وَالْجُوعِ وَنَقْصٍ مِّنَ الْأَمْوَالِ
وَالْأَنْفُسِ وَالْفُتُوحَاتِ ۖ وَيَبْخِرُ الصُّبْرِينَ ۝ الَّذِينَ إِذَا أَصَابَهُمْ
مُصِيبَةٌ قَالُوا إِنَّا لِلَّهِ وَإِنَّا إِلَيْهِ رَاجِعُونَ ۝ أُولَٰئِكَ عَلَيْهِمْ صَلَوَاتٌ
مِّن رَّبِّهِمْ وَرَحْمَةٌ وَأُولَٰئِكَ هُمُ الْمُتَّقُونَ ۝

We shall certainly test you by afflicting you with fear, hunger, loss of properties and lives and fruits. Give glad tidings, then, to those who remain patient; those who when any affliction smites them, they say: "Verily, we belong to Allah, and it is to Him that we are destined to return; such are the people who are rightly guided."

(Al-Baqarah: 155-157)

وَلَوْ يَشَاءُ اللَّهُ لَآتَيْنَاكُمْ مِنْهُمْ وَلَكِنْ لِيَبْلُوَ أَبْعَضَكُمْ بَعْضٌ

If Allah had so willed, He would have Himself exacted retribution from them. (But He did not do so) that He may test some of you by means of others. (Muhammad 47: 4)

That is to think that Allah cannot crush his rebels and hence asks for your help. No! He is such an unstoppable force that He could destroy them in the blink of an eye and establish His religion. But He has placed the burden of this Jihad, hard work and sacrifice on our shoulders so that He wants to test us human beings against one another. Unless and until you clash with the worshippers of falsehood and face difficulties, hardships and dangers, true believers cannot be differentiated from the false claimants. And unless and until useless people are separated from the useful, that party cannot come into existence capable of taking on the responsibility of God's viceregency on earth.

For this reason, today the future of the world is not dependent on whether or not man gets the true ideology because the true ideology is available. However, it is dependent on whether or not a party rises from among the human beings comprising of those who truly believe, are totally committed and ready to sacrifice everything dear to them in the way of God.

We are told that such people are not found these days. Such people were born in a blessed era and the Creator cancelled making such models. But this is merely delusion which only those people suffer from who are disappointed with themselves. People with all kinds of abilities and talents are found in every period of time. Where hypocritical weak-willed and easy-going people have always been found and are still found, there we also find people ready to sacrifice everything for their beliefs. You can see with your own eyes today that not one and not two but thousands have believed in Hitler and Germany who for the sake of their faith penetrate the airspace of the enemy with their jets knowing full-well that innumerable hunters are lying in ambush. If you look at the history of the Russian revolution, which happened just 20-25 years ago, you will learn that thousands of people who believed in the revolutionary ideas, have been consistently making sacrifices of all kinds for half a century – they were sent to the hell called Siberia, hanged, moved from one country to another in exile, murdered all their desires of personal prosperity, brought

misery upon themselves by their own hands and they did all this when the notion of the end of Tsar's empire was hard to imagine. Don't go far, just take a look at India. Here, did those young men who had the misconception that they could liberate their country through carnage, fall short of destroying their lives and facing dangers in the pursuit of their goal? What conceivable calamity did they not have to endure? They had to endure torture in jails, life-imprisonment and summary executions. The arguments are not whether their ways were right or wrong but this definitely proves that the quality of sacrificing life, property and personal desires and enduring difficulties for a mission is still found in the human beings. Gandhi's Civil disobedience is a matter of our times. Were there not such people in the inhabitants of India who endured lathi-charge, imprisonment and loss of property? Didn't the farmers of Bardoli patiently endure the confiscation and auction of their land, cattle, houses and even dishes? Then how can it be said that these qualities of sacrifice and altruism are missing in today's people which were found in the previous generations?! If man can do all this by believing in Hitler, Marx and Gandhi then can't he do anything by believing in God? If the soil of a country has such drawing power that a man can accept the sacrifice of his life and property then don't God's pleasure and closeness to Him have such a power? Hence those who are themselves cowards and weak do not have the right to say that the kind of determined and strong-willed men, needed for this great task, cannot be found. Although they can surely say about themselves that:

فَاذْهَبْ أَنْتَ وَرَبُّكَ فَقَاتِلَا إِنَّا هُنَا قَاعِدُونَ ○

Go forth, then, you and your Lord, and fight both of you As for us, we will remain sitting here.

(Al-Ma'idah 6:24)

